

1228. Also, petition of J. O. F. Covell, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the Esch-Cummins railroad bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1229. Also, petition of the A. H. Colmary & Co., of Baltimore, Md., relative to certain legislation now pending; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1230. Also, petition of the Farmers' National Bank, of Annapolis, Md., favoring the Cummins railroad bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1231. Also, petition of the Hubbard Fertilizer Co., of Baltimore, Md., relative to railroad legislation now pending; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1232. Also, petition of Hubbard Fertilizer Co., Baltimore, Md., favoring anti-strike clause in railroad bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1233. Also, petition of United States Customs Inspectors Association, favoring Senate bill 3418 and House bill 10532; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1234. Also, petition of R. Lancaster Williams & Co., Baltimore, Md., relating to railroad legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1235. Also, petition of Blue Ribbon Candy Co., Baltimore, Md., favoring railroad bill as passed by the Senate; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1236. Also, petition of Benjamin C. Baxter, Baltimore, Md., opposing Cummins bill and urging retention of Government control of the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1237. Also, petition of Margaret S. Brogdan, supervisor social-service department, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indorsing appropriation for social hygiene; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1238. Also, petition of J. A. Bokel Co., of Baltimore, Md., favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1239. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, relative to the railroad situation in regard to tariffs, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1240. By Mr. STINESS: Petition of the President Valera Branch of the Friends of Irish Freedom, of Arctic, R. I., relative to certain legislation now pending; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1241. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Connecticut Editorial Association, urging legislation against anarchistic movements but opposing anything that will curtail free speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, January 31, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we can not understand the measure, the moral and spiritual significance of the common facts of life without Thy inspiration and guidance. We have seen from life's minute beginning up at last to man the ever-increasing purpose running. We lift our hearts to Thee to know the meaning of this larger purpose of life to lay hold on eternal life as Thou hast revealed it to us through Thy Son. Grant us this day to live in high and holy communion with Thyself. For Christ's sake. Amen.

On request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

FOREIGN SECURITIES IN THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 191).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of October 17, 1919, a statement showing the financial obligations of foreign Governments offered in the United States since August 1, 1914, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ARMY AND NAVY OFFICERS (S. DOC. NO. 194).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication of the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 7th instant, lists of commissioned officers in the War Department assigned to duty in other than strictly combat or line organizations, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

THE AMERICAN METAL CO. (S. DOC. NO. 192).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Alien Property Custodian, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 12th instant, certain information relative to the sale of trust certificates of the American Metal Co. to a syndicate, etc., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

EAST WASHINGTON HEIGHTS TRACTION RAILROAD (S. DOC. NO. 195).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co. for the year ended December 31, 1919, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4382) to confer on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to determine the respective rights of and differences between the Fort Berthold Indians and the Government of the United States.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6863) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MAPES, Mr. FOCHT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky managers at the conference on the part of the House.

HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6863) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CALDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CALDER, and Mr. SHEPPARD conferees on the part of the Senate.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY (S. DOC. NO. 193).

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD in connection with what I am now saying a statement which I made to the press yesterday, and also the statement made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I do this because it contains a brief report of what the committee which has been meeting lately tried to do in regard to the reservations. I think it would be well to have it completely in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT MADE TO THE PRESS IN REGARD TO THE MEETINGS WITH REFERENCE TO RESERVATIONS TO THE TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY BY SENATOR HENRY CABOT LODGE AND SENATOR GILBERT M. HITCHCOCK.

"For the past two weeks nine Senators—five Democrats and four Republicans—have been meeting to consider the question of changes in the reservations adopted by the Senate before the adjournment of the last session of Congress, commonly known as the Lodge reservations. The Senators who thus met did not constitute a committee. The meetings were entirely informal, and it was understood at the outset that they had no power or authority whatever to bind anyone. Their only purpose was to see whether there were any changes which they would be willing to lay before all the other Members of the Senate for their consideration. No final agreement, even to submit any changes to their colleagues in the Senate, was reached. Some tentative agreements were obtained. Reservations 3, 8, 12, and 13 were tentatively accepted by all without change. It was tentatively agreed to submit the following changes to all the other Senators for their consideration:

"(A). The resolving clause, which is as follows:

"Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany concluded at Versailles on the 28th day of June, 1919, subject to the following reservations and understandings, which are hereby made a part and condition of this resolution of ratification, which ratification is not to take effect or bind the United States until the said reservations and understandings adopted by the Senate have been accepted by an exchange of notes as a part and a condition of this resolution of ratification by at least three of the four principal allied and associated powers, to wit, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan:

"The Democrats proposed to strike out all after the word 'ratification,' in line 6, to the end of the clause. The Republicans proposed the following substitute:

"Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany signed at Versailles on the 28th of June, 1919, subject to the following reservations and understandings, which are hereby made a part and a condition of this resolution of ratification, which ratification is not to take effect or bind the United States until the said reservations and understandings adopted by the Senate have been accepted as a part and a condition of this resolution of ratification by the allied and associated powers, and a failure on the part of the allied and associated powers to make objection to said reservations and understandings prior to the deposit of ratification by the United States shall be taken as a full acceptance of such reservations and understandings by said powers.

"This proposal was tentatively agreed to.

"Reservation No. 4, which is as follows:

"4. The United States reserves to itself exclusively the right to decide what questions are within its domestic jurisdiction and declares that all domestic and political questions relating wholly or in part to its internal affairs, including immigration, labor, coastwise traffic, the tariff, commerce, the suppression of traffic in women and children and in opium and other dangerous drugs, and all other domestic questions, are solely within the jurisdiction of the United States and are not under this treaty to be submitted in any way either to arbitration or to the consideration of the council or of the assembly of the League of Nations, or any agency thereof, or to the decision or recommendation of any other power.

"Various changes were suggested to this reservation. It was finally tentatively agreed to insert the word 'internal,' before the word 'commerce,' in line 3, and to strike out, in line 5, the words 'all other domestic questions,' which were a superfluous repetition.

"Reservation No. 6, which is as follows:

"6. The United States withholds its assent to articles 156, 157, and 158, and reserves full liberty of action with respect to any controversy which may arise under said articles between the Republic of China and the Empire of Japan.

"It was tentatively agreed to strike out the words: 'between the Republic of China and the Empire of Japan.'

"Reservation No. 7:

"7. The Congress of the United States will provide by law for the appointment of the representatives of the United States in the assembly and the council of the League of Nations, and may in its discretion provide for the participation of the United States in any commission, committee, tribunal, court, council, or conference, or in the selection of any members thereof and for the appointment of members of said commissions, committees, tribunals, courts, councils, or conferences, or any other representatives under the treaty of peace, or in carrying out its provisions, and until such participation and appointment have been so provided for and the powers and duties of such representatives have been defined by law no person shall represent the United States under either said League of Nations or the treaty of peace with Germany or be authorized to perform any act for or on behalf of the United States thereunder, and no citizen of the United States shall be selected or appointed as a member of said commissions, committees, tribunals, courts, councils, or conferences except with the approval of the Senate of the United States.

"It was tentatively agreed to substitute for this reservation the following wording, which is precisely the same in effect except that under the substitute there is no promise made to pass such a statute, the original form containing the words 'The Congress of the United States will provide':

"No person is or shall be authorized to represent the United States, nor shall any citizen of the United States be eligible, as a member of any body or agency established or authorized by said treaty of peace with Germany, except pursuant to an act of the Congress of the United States providing for his appointment and defining his powers and duties.

"Reservation No. 10, which is as follows:

"10. If the United States shall at any time adopt any plan for the limitation of armaments proposed by the council of the League of Nations under the provisions of article 8, it reserves the right to increase such armaments without the consent of the council whenever the United States is threatened with invasion or engaged in war.

"Many suggestions were made for changes in this reservation, and it was finally tentatively agreed to adopt the following substitute proposed by the Republicans:

"No plan for the limitation of armaments proposed by the council of the League of Nations under the provisions of article 8 shall be held as binding the United States until the same shall have been accepted by Congress.

"Reservation No. 1, which is as follows:

"1. The United States so understands and construes article 1 that in case of notice of withdrawal from the League of Nations, as provided in said article, the United States shall be the sole judge as to whether all its international obligations and all its obligations under the said covenant have been fulfilled, and notice of withdrawal by the United States may be given by a concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States.

"It was proposed by the Democrats to strike out the word 'concurrent' and insert the word 'joint.' It was suggested by the Republicans to amend this reservation by striking out all after the word 'given,' in line 7, and inserting 'by the President

or whenever a majority of both Houses of Congress may deem it necessary.'

"No decision was reached as to the changes proposed in this reservation.

"Reservation No. 9, which is as follows:

"9. The United States shall not be obligated to contribute to any expenses of the League of Nations, or of the secretariat, or of any commission or committee or conference or other agency organized under the League of Nations or under the treaty, or for the purpose of carrying out the treaty provisions unless and until an appropriation of funds available for such expenses shall have been made by the Congress of the United States.

"It was proposed to strike out the word 'or,' in line 3, and insert 'except the office force and expenses.' No decision was reached upon this change.

"Reservation No. 11:

"11. The United States reserves the right to permit, in its discretion, the nationals of a covenant-breaking State, as defined in article 16 of the covenant of the League of Nations, residing within the United States or in countries other than that violating said article 16, to continue their commercial, financial, and personal relations with the nationals of the United States.

"It was proposed to strike out, in lines 19 and 20, the words 'or in countries other than that violating said article 16.' No decision was reached on this proposal.

"Reservation No. 14, which is as follows:

"14. The United States assumes no obligation to be bound by any election, decision, report, or finding of the council or assembly in which any member of the league and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of empire, in the aggregate have cast more than one vote, and assumes no obligation to be bound by any decision, report, or finding of the council or assembly arising out of any dispute between the United States and any member of the league if such member, or any self-governing dominion, colony, empire, or part of empire united with it politically has voted.

"The following was proposed as a substitute for this reservation:

"Until part 1, being the covenant of the League of Nations, shall be so amended as to provide that the United States shall be entitled to cast a number of votes equal to that which any member of the league and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of empire, in the aggregate, shall be entitled to cast, the United States assumes no obligation to be bound, except in cases where Congress has previously given its consent, by any election, decision, report, or finding of the council or assembly in which any member of the league and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of empire in the aggregate have cast more than one vote.

"The United States assumes no obligation to be bound by any decision, report, or finding of the council or assembly arising out of any dispute between the United States and any member of the league if such member or any self-governing dominion, colony, empire, or part of empire united with it politically, has voted.

"No decision was reached on this change.

"Reservation No. 2:

"2. The United States assumes no obligation to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country or to interfere in controversies between nations—whether members of the league or not—under the provisions of article 10, or to employ the military or naval forces of the United States under any article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which, under the Constitution, has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military or naval forces of the United States, shall by act or joint resolution so provide.

"Various amendments and substitutes were offered to this reservation in regard to article 10 of the treaty. It was found impossible to agree on any change in this reservation to be presented to the other Senators.

"Reservation No. 5:

"5. The United States will not submit to arbitration or to inquiry by the assembly or by the council of the League of Nations, provided for in said treaty of peace, any questions which in the judgment of the United States depend upon or relate to its long-established policy, commonly known as the Monroe doctrine; said doctrine is to be interpreted by the United States alone and is hereby declared to be wholly outside the jurisdiction of said League of Nations and entirely unaffected by any provision contained in the said treaty of peace with Germany.

"It was proposed by the Democrats to strike out the words 'said doctrine is to be interpreted by the United States alone.' To this consent could not be obtained.

"Speaking for myself alone, I have only this to say: That I was unable to agree to any change in reservations 2 and 5, dealing with article 10 and the Monroe doctrine. In my opinion reservation No. 2, which provides that we shall assume no obligation of any kind under article 10, except the one mentioned in the treaty, that we should ourselves respect the boundaries of other nations, can not possibly permit of change.

"The change proposed in reservation No. 5 in regard to the Monroe doctrine was an absolutely vital one, because it was asserted as an official interpretation by the representatives of Great Britain that the Monroe doctrine under the treaty was to be interpreted by the league. To this I, for one, could never assent, and in view of the statement made in Paris by the British delegation, to which I have referred, I regard the line which it was proposed to strike out as absolutely necessary. The United States has always interpreted the Monroe doctrine alone.

It is our policy. No one else has ever attempted to interpret it, and it is something, in my judgment, which ought never to be permitted, even by the most remote implication. If we should strike out that phrase now after it had been accepted by the Senate, it would lead to a direct inference that we left that question open. The right to interpret the Monroe doctrine, pertaining to the United States alone, must never be open to question.

"H. C. LODGE."

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 31, 1920.]

SENATOR HITCHCOCK'S STATEMENT.

"Senator HITCHCOCK said:

"To-morrow I shall not be here, but Senator WALSH of Montana will give notice for me that on Tuesday, February 10, I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the peace treaty. I shall be back here before that time. It is my intention to return to Washington from my home in Nebraska Thursday next.

"At the meeting to-day we presented the last Taft reservation on article 10 as our proposition of a compromise. There was some conversation as to the exact meaning of the reservation. We urged the Republicans to say whether they could accept it or consider it.

"Senator LODGE said definitely he could not accept it. We then asked if the Republicans had a counterproposal or would make one. Senator LODGE replied that he could not make any proposition on article 10 other than the one contained in the LODGE program of reservations. He said he could not consent to any modification.

"We did not take up the Monroe doctrine, but Senator LODGE was equally positive there could be no alteration of that reservation. We had accepted the reservation on the Monroe doctrine, with the exception that we proposed an elimination of the right of the United States alone to interpret it.

"I suggested that perhaps we could agree on some way of taking the treaty up in the Senate, but Senator LODGE said he did not care to have any meeting on that subject."

"Do you think you have enough votes to get the treaty up in the Senate?" Senator HITCHCOCK was asked.

"We do not know."

COUNTS ON 43 VOTES.

"How many Democrats do you count on?" was the next inquiry.

"There will be at least 43 Democratic votes," replied Senator HITCHCOCK. "Before the question of the Senate taking up the treaty comes before it for determination conferences will have been held by the Democrats, and possibly the Republicans, to decide whether the reservations as tentatively agreed upon in the bipartisan conferences shall be taken up singly or en bloc.

"There was no dramatic climax to the conferences. It was agreed by all that unless some compromise could be worked out on article 10 it would be useless to continue the meetings."

"Was your move to-day discussed with the White House in advance?" Senator HITCHCOCK was asked.

"It was not. We are running entirely independently of the White House in this action."

"Senator HITCHCOCK said he was satisfied that Senator UNDERWOOD will make no move to get consideration of his resolution for a formal committee of conciliation until after the effort is made to get the treaty before the Senate for open consideration on the floor."

Mr. LODGE. I ask at the same time that the statement may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], I give notice that on Tuesday, the 10th day of February, he will ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

RAILROAD CONTROL.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, there has been a good deal in the newspapers of late about the farmers of the country joining hands with the railroad brotherhoods in favoring and demanding an extension for two years of the Government control of railroads, and a good deal about the farmers of the country favoring further Government control of railroads, even Government ownership of railroads. A few days ago a delegation of farmers—I read in the newspapers—from Wisconsin called at the White House to urge the President to withdraw his order for the restoration of the railroads to their owners the 1st of March and urging him to favor an extension for two years of the Government control of railroads.

I have a statement issued on that subject by Mr. E. A. Calvin, Washington representative of the Association of State

Farmers Union Presidents. It is one of the best and most sensible statements on the subject I have seen, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF STATE FARMERS UNION PRESIDENTS,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1920.

To Members of the United States Congress:

As considerable is being said in the press and elsewhere to the effect that delegations of farmers have recently visited Washington, demanding that the Government retain control of the railroads for at least two years, and stating that this is the wish of the farmers of this country, I feel it to be my duty as a representative of the farmers to set forth their views on this question and to transmit to you resolutions which were adopted by different farm organizations representing the actual American farmers.

At the annual meeting of the Oklahoma Division of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, held on August 19 and 20, 1919, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"We view with alarm and oppose the Government ownership of railroads, and especially the Plumb plan, of the Government buying the railroads at public expense, turning them over to the railroad employees, and guaranteeing the railroad employees whatever wages they demand and a division of the profits. If Congress in its wisdom does this, we ask them to also buy all of our farms and their equipment, hire the farmers to operate them at two-thirds of the hourly wage scale paid the average railroad employee, and sell the production to the consumer at cost."

This about expresses the views of an overwhelming majority of the farmers of the Nation, who are members of the Farmers' Union and other farm organizations in the several States, including Louisiana, Alabama, Ohio, Texas, Illinois, and Iowa, which organizations adopted similar resolutions opposing Government ownership.

At the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, held in Chicago November 14 last, the following resolution was adopted:

"We are opposed to Government ownership of public utilities. We demand the early return of the railroads to private control, under such conditions and regulations as will render adequate service at just and equitable rates. We particularly demand immediate attention to restoring the efficiency of livestock and other perishable transportation, both in car equipment and train schedules."

If there is any class of our citizens who have suffered from inefficient railroad service and delay in transportation in the last two or three years, it is the farmers; and you can take it as a fact, if we are to believe what they say in their resolutions, that a majority of the farmers of this Nation desire the return of the railroads to their owners at the earliest possible moment, and we consider the President's announcement that they shall be returned on March 1 as sound in principle and highly expedient under existing conditions.

At the fifty-third annual session of the National Grange, at Detroit, Mich., November 18, 1919, the following resolution was adopted:

"While recognizing the evils of uncurbed power growing from swollen fortunes in the hands of unscrupulous and ambitious individuals, the National Grange declares that in a government of a free democracy is lodged ample power to curb all such evils. We declare our opposition to Government ownership and to nationalization of business and industry. We favor the safeguarding and protection of private property on the broad ground that only by the full development of the right of private property can there be perpetuated the full measure of individual initiative and emulation upon which a democracy is based and by which its future is assured."

All fair-minded people will readily agree that the above is sound in principle and in harmony with our democratic form of government. The experience of the last three years of the Government's endeavoring to engage in operating and conducting different lines of business has demonstrated the folly of nationalizing business under control of the Federal Government by commissions or licenses, and the fact has been asserted, and has not been denied, that when the Government endeavored to produce castor oil, those in charge of this industry for the Government succeeded in producing only 2 quarts at a cost of several million dollars. I feel safe in asserting that if this task had been left to the common-sense farmers of Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma, where castor-oil beans are grown, the

Government would have received an abundance of castor oil at a minimum cost.

Another resolution adopted by the grange is very pertinent and appropriate at this time:

"In war time price fixing may have been necessary; in peace time the grange regards Government price fixing as unjustifiable and indefensible."

What the farmers of this Nation most desire is to extend the market for American products all over the world, and especially at this particular time, when the teeming millions of Europe and Asia are reported to be suffering for the lack of clothing and food; and if steps are taken to open the industries of Europe and the markets of the world to American products, and production in our country be restored to normal, those engaged in agriculture, manufacturing, and all avenues of distribution will soon enjoy an unprecedented prosperity, and at the same time the suffering in European and Asiatic countries will be greatly relieved.

What the farmers want is constructive and not destructive legislation. They are not asking, nor do they desire, any special legislation for the benefit of the farmers only. They want equal opportunities for all, and special privileges for none, and if this policy is adopted by our Government and extended over the world's markets, there will be a revival in all industries as well as that of agriculture, and they desire to extend the American markets for foods and raw materials as well as manufactured articles to all nations of the world.

The farmers everywhere are on record as opposing the establishing and maintaining by the Federal Government of employment bureau agencies over the country to be conducted by the Federal Government, and are opposed to all similar class legislation. They want to be left alone in the pursuance of their business, and do not want their affairs interfered with by socialistic rules and regulations promulgated by a certain department at Washington.

Respectfully,

E. A. CALVIN.

HERBERT C. HOOVER.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, quite a good deal of criticism has been indulged in with reference to Mr. Hoover, and there has been question as to his Americanism and his citizenship. I wish to say that while I had charge in the Senate of the food-control bill I came in frequent contact with Mr. Hoover, and I found him at all times to be thoroughly loyal to this country, thoroughly patriotic, and using his best endeavors to assist in successfully prosecuting the war.

I saw in the New York World of the 28th instant a statement with reference to Mr. Hoover over the signature of Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, president of Stanford University, who has known him for a great many years. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOWS HOOVER KEPT IN CLOSE TOUCH WITH UNITED STATES.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIF., January 27.

The campaign of lies about Herbert Hoover that is again being given free circulation is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. If facts are sought, I consider it my duty as Hoover's most intimate friend since boyhood to state the truth for those who wish it, so that they may not be misled by the renewal of the former deliberate attempt to attack his nationality, citizenship, and Americanism.

I have maintained close contact with Mr. Hoover throughout his career and know intimately of his comings and goings; his family, birth, raising, and education are known to me in detail. Iowa, Oregon, and California were his only residences, except for his work on the geological survey of Arkansas.

Since his graduation from Stanford University in mining and engineering his professional life always had a world scope. It began during the period of some 12 years prior to the war, when he enjoyed an international practice as an engineer. No calendar year ever went by, with the exception of 1898 and 1917, in which he was not for some portion of the year a resident of the United States.

On these two occasions of considerable absence he was engaged in engineering constructive work in Australia. His engineering practice has taken him into every country in the world. It is a credit to the universities of the United States that her engineers are in such demand in such work.

It is within my knowledge that the total period that Hoover could have been actually in England would not exceed an aggregate of more than 3 or 4 years out of the total 46 of his life, although at times he left his family there when he was obliged to journey to Russia and other parts of Europe on professional

business. His son came home in time for the fall term of school in California as soon as he was old enough for public school.

Mr. Hoover has been actively connected with Stanford University, acting as adviser to the president in the engineering department or as a trustee of the university. For over 12 years he has maintained for his family a home either in San Francisco or at the university. During this entire time his life has emphasized those sterling American qualities that are the pride of us all.

As his friend, college mate, physician, and colleague I am happy to say that I know no finer character, no better American, no more genuine lover of the United States than Herbert Hoover.

I hope that we may speedily have conditions in this country so that vilification, tirades, and abuse may be supplanted by constructive public service.

RAY LYMAN WILBUR,
President of Stanford University.

REAR ADMIRAL CARY T. GRAYSON.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, a lady, Miss Davis, came to my committee room a week or 10 days ago and made complaint that she had been evicted from her rooms or property that she had occupied, the property being owned by Admiral Grayson, and stated that it was because of an increase of rent demanded. The attorney for Admiral Grayson, or Mrs. Grayson, has written me a letter explaining the transaction. The letter states that Miss Davis was evicted for nonpayment of rent and that the property has since been rented for a lower rental than was paid by the evicted tenant.

I am glad to present this letter, and I ask to have it printed with that explanation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I did not quite understand what the letter contains.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois stated that complaint had been made that some lady was evicted from the premises of Admiral Grayson upon the grounds that the rent had been increased. He files a letter from Admiral Grayson's attorney stating that she was evicted for nonpayment of rent, and that the premises have since been rented for a less sum than they had been rented to her.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 27, 1920.

HON. LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to your remarks in the Senate on Friday, January 16, in which you stated that you have been informed that Admiral Grayson had evicted a woman tenant from a house of which he was the owner because she objected to an attempted profiteering raise in rent on his part. I assume that as a fair-minded man you will be as anxious to correct an error in your statement as you were to condemn Admiral Grayson because of a supposed delinquency on his part. He is the owner of 1602 Sixteenth Street N.W., in this city, which adjoins the house where Admiral and Mrs. Grayson reside. On the 31st day of October, 1918, Susan L. Davis entered into a lease agreement with John W. Thompson & Co. (Inc.), the latter acting as the agents for the owner, by the terms of which Miss Davis rented 1602 Sixteenth Street, partially furnished, for the period of one year beginning October 10, 1918, at a monthly rental of \$175 per month, payable in monthly installments in advance on the 10th day of each month beginning October 10, 1918. Almost immediately after she took possession of the premises Miss Davis began to fall back in the payment of rent, until it became necessary to enter suit against her for the possession of the premises. This step was decided upon by John W. Thompson & Co. (Inc.), and, acting as their attorney, I brought suit in its name, under the provision of the aforementioned lease, in the municipal court of the District of Columbia. This cause was known as Landlord and Tenant Proceedings No. 174673, and was for possession of the premises by reason of the nonpayment of rent provided for in the lease. At the hearing of the cause judgment was given in favor of John W. Thompson & Co. (Inc.) and against Miss Davis. After judgment had been obtained against her, Miss Davis came in and paid \$175 and \$1.85 costs of the suit. This paid the rent up to April 10, 1919, and \$100 on account of the month ending May 10, 1919, leaving \$75 due on the month ending May 10, 1919. I had numerous interviews with Miss Davis during the month of June in an endeavor to collect the rent, which she promised to pay faithfully many times but which she neglected to do.

It thereupon became necessary to institute suit against her again, which I did in the early part of July, in Landlord and sion of premises and for \$425 rent due up to and including the

9th day of July, 1919, being \$75 balance due for the month ending May 9, 1919, and \$175 for the month ending July 9, 1919. When the case was called Miss Davis failed to appear, and although I could have taken judgment by default I refused to do so, and had the case set down for hearing at a later date. I saw Miss Davis personally and had her agree upon the date of the hearing, and that she would be there in court. When the case was called again she neglected to appear and judgment was had against her for possession of the premises and for \$425 rent up to the 10th day of July, 1919. Miss Davis pleaded so hard to be Tenant Proceedings No. 177491, which suit was for the possession allowed to stay in the house and made so many promises that she would pay, not only the arrears in rent but all future rent, that I agreed to allow her to stay on for a month or two to see if she could make good her promises. She was keeping a boarding house, and she received from roomers and boarders in excess of \$900 per month, according to the figures given to me by some of the boarders in the house. It appeared to me that being in receipt of so much money each month she could pay the rent if she were so inclined, and I believed her when she said that she would do so. I was very loath to dispossess her and put her out in the street, because of the many "hard-luck tales" she had to tell. It became apparent, however, that she abused my confidence, and on September the 18th it became necessary for me to take steps to dispossess her and put a deputy marshal in the premises, which I did by virtue of the second judgment above referred to, action under which I had postponed in order to give her an opportunity to live up to these promises made by her. She thereupon paid part of the rent due and entered into a written agreement with me to pay one-half of the money which she received from her boarders on account of current rent and back rent. She did not live up to this agreement, however, and it was not until September 20 that I was able to collect the \$425 which was due on the rent up to July 10, 1919, and for which I had obtained a judgment as aforesaid. It became necessary for me to sue her again, which I did in Landlord and Tenant Proceedings No. 179632, and obtained judgment against her for the premises. I then referred the matter to Mrs. Grayson, who acted for her husband, whose time was taken up by the President. As a matter of fact, all my dealings have been with Mrs. Grayson, and I never spoke to Admiral Grayson in my life until after this case was completely closed. I explained to her the difficulty I had in collecting the rent, and also that it was my belief that Miss Davis would not pay either the current rent or the back rent, and that my advice was that she should be dispossessed of the premises. Mrs. Grayson, however, was very sympathetic toward Miss Davis and relied upon Miss Davis's numerous promises to pay. She instructed me to allow Miss Davis to remain in the house another month. At the end of that time Miss Davis not only did not pay anything on the accrued rental but paid only \$100 of the \$175 due for the current month. When I reported this to Mrs. Grayson she was still generous enough to allow Miss Davis to stay on in the house in hope that she would be able to extricate herself from her financial difficulties. Miss Davis did not live up to her promises to pay, and in our opinion was able to do so but refused to do so. It thereupon became necessary to dispossess her, which was done on or about the 20th day of December, 1919, at which time Miss Davis owed \$75 rent on the month ending August 10, 1919, and \$175 for each month thereafter, making a total of \$775 due up to and including the 10th day of December, 1919. She has not paid and refuses to pay anything on account of this back rent, and it was for this and not for any refusal to pay an increased rental that she was dispossessed. She was treated as leniently and generously as any tenant that I ever knew or heard of. So far from profiteering, I might say that Admiral Grayson has rented the house for a less price than he rented it to Miss Davis, and that he was induced to rent it to Miss Davis to be conducted as a boarding house right next door to his own home only because, at that time, there were numerous war workers in the city without shelter. The rental paid for this house containing eight bedrooms, two bathrooms, a large parlor, dining room, and kitchen was extremely moderate. The statements made in this letter can be verified by the records of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, by correspondence with Miss Davis, copies of which are in my possession, and by testimony of a number of boarders in Miss Davis's house whose names I will furnish you if you so desire.

Very truly, yours,

I. J. COSTIGAN.

PUBLIC PRINTING.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I invite the attention of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the guardian of the RECORD, to the request of the Senator from Illinois. Does he think it proper to print such communications in the RECORD?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I expect within a day or two now to have statistics prepared in relation to the printing not only of the RECORD but the printing of speeches. I hope to present them to the Senate in a very few days. I am quite sure that when the statistics are presented the Senate of the United States is going to agree to stop the printing of matter of every conceivable character and nature in the RECORD.

We have seven men scouring the country to-day for paper upon which to print the RECORD. Senators will notice that in the last few days the RECORD has been printed upon paper that is not black, but nearly so; the poorest sort of paper. We never would have used it in the Government Printing Office a few years ago for any purpose whatever. It is all the paper that we can get in the United States to print the RECORD upon, and if we are going to have a RECORD, we have got to conserve the print paper.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, in his criticism of the use of newsprint paper, did the Senator from Utah extend it to the various departmental activities engaged in sending out many tons of material? Literally, tons of it come to my office.

Mr. SMOOT. I have done so many times, and I will say to the Senator that later—and I have the matter under way now—we shall find out exactly what printing has been done by each one of the departments.

Mr. President, I have from newspapers of the country letters referring to reports from the Government departments and showing that there is printing only upon one side of the paper—whole reports are so printed—with absolutely no use made of half of the paper. We also find that some of the departments are to-day sending out such printed matter in linen envelopes.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. It seems to me the newspapers should never complain of the scarcity of print paper so long as they devote two or three pages daily to the sporting news. Why can they not eliminate those two or three pages of sporting news? We should certainly get along much better if they did so.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is much in what the Senator from Minnesota says. I may go further than that, and say that I think the Sunday newspapers throughout the United States have grown to such proportions that there ought to be a halt called on their size by the newspaper publishers themselves.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me at that point?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The few reports which I get from the newspapers in reference to this matter are from what might be denominated the smaller newspapers, the smaller dailies and weeklies; they are not the newspapers which are known as the large metropolitan newspapers. Those smaller newspapers universally complain of the paper which they think is uselessly consumed by the large newspapers, particularly in the Sunday editions, and the funny page, and also the sporting news, as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has suggested. They claim that because they are small papers and have not so much money invested and are not able to purchase the large amount of paper purchased by the metropolitan press, they are discriminated against in favor of the larger papers, which get their paper cheaper than they can. They complain that they are not able to get even sufficient paper to print their small editions; and many of them have gone out of business.

Mr. SMOOT. I have received, I was going to say, thousands of just such complaints as those which are referred to by the Senator from Nebraska. The larger newspapers have contracts for their paper in some cases for years ahead; and to-day the small newspapers of the country are doing just what we are compelled to do now to secure paper for the RECORD; they are hunting from one end of the country to the other in order to purchase sufficient paper to print their regular edition.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. SMOOT. And they are paying almost any price asked in order to get it.

Mr. NORRIS. The fact is they are paying prices that are four or five times what they paid previously, and are paying much higher prices than other papers pay for their newsprint paper.

Mr. SMOOT. That may be the case.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will permit me, I will give him an instance of the practice which has just been commented upon. I heartily agree with what the Senator from Utah has said about the reckless and almost criminal waste of newsprint paper by some of the departments of the Government. An instance of it came to my knowledge only the other day. I received a communication from Mr. Will A. Campbell, editor of the Helena (Mont.) Independent, accompanied by exhibits in the form of some printed material

which he had received from some department of the Government which maintains a mailing list and sends out Government publications. I can not say now just what department it is, for I have not the exhibits with me, but he had received three copies of an identical publication. One was addressed to Mr. Will A. Campbell, Helena, Mont.; another was addressed to Mr. W. A. Campbell, Helena, Mont.; and another was addressed to the editor of the Independent, Helena, Mont. They were all the same thing, and my correspondent writes me that such occurrences are frequent; that that is only an instance of what is happening every day.

Here is an instance of absolute waste brought about by pure and sheer carelessness. A great deal of it could be remedied by proper attention on the part of the departments to their mailing lists and to the documents they send out. There should be some remedy for this waste. I hope some method of stopping it may be found and adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, along the line of the observations of the Senator from Montana I will say that I have no doubt that there is not a business man in the United States who does not receive every week in the year over 100 circulars of the same kind from the departments of our Government. Not long ago I had a business man collect for me the publications and documents received by him in the course of three days, and in those three days, as I remember, 165 Government publications were received by that one business man of Kansas.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Government publications?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; Government publications. I asked him to send them to me just as he received them; I opened the envelopes containing the publications and sorted them out. There were 11 of one kind from different departments of the Government, word for word alike, and there were 8 of another kind word for word alike. Talk about the waste of paper! It is wicked on the part of the Government of the United States.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the Senate has been very economical in the space occupied by it in the Record. I have refrained from disturbing the Government Printing Office greatly during this session. I have had the impulse, but have succeeded in resisting it. There is in the south end of my district a newspaper known as the Daily Breeze, which enjoys a very healthful circulation for a country newspaper publishing information not only as to its own affairs but as to the affairs of other people. Its editor is Frank Reed. He recently wrote me that he had been fined \$10 by the internal-revenue collector of his district because he was late in filing his capital-stock return, which should have been in the form of an affidavit that the par value of the stock of the Breeze Printing Co. did not exceed \$99,000. The capital stock was \$4,000. The company prints a daily paper in a town of about 6,000 population. Under the law the internal-revenue collector could have assessed a fine of \$10,000, but he wisely made it an amount which it was possible for the Breeze to pay.

So the Breeze paid up and continued on its way. Mr. Reed writes me:

Our excuse in mitigation of this crime was that the business mail from the Internal Revenue Office, being franked, is identical in appearance with the mail from every department of the Government, which comes to this office in such volume that it would require a private secretary to separate the important mail from that which goes into the waste basket, and, not being possessed of a sufficient income to hire a private secretary, this call for the report went into the waste basket with a great deal of newsprint wasted by the departments, to the editor's subsequent discomfiture.

This communication I have selected from probably a thousand similar ones on this subject from a single State. The departmental mail has become a public pest even to a newspaper man. These knights of the paste pot and shears are entitled to protection from governmental activities along this line, and they are asking for it, and I think, it being in the line of economy of print paper, that it would be well for the department to heed their demand.

Mr. President, if I did not ask to have the letter from the attorney of Admiral Grayson printed at length in the Record I should like to do so, because in fairness to him it ought to be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order has already been made to print the letter in the Record.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a word in relation to the printing that has been ordered by the Senate. I have had extracted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the proceedings of the Senate all of the speeches that have been delivered on the peace treaty. I have had them bound in one volume, which I have here upon my desk. This [exhibiting] is the result. There are a few over 3,000 printed pages, containing an average of 2,100 words per page, or a total number of words of 6,300,000. Those represent the speeches delivered on the floor of the Senate. I started to segregate the pages of matter that have been

inserted in the Record at the request of Senators, including newspaper articles, editorials, and letters from citizens; but it soon developed that it was altogether impossible to put them in any reasonable number of books. So it was concluded to abandon the effort. This shows, Mr. President, where we are drifting; and I hope that the Senate, sooner or later—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that a public document?

Mr. SMOOT. No; it is not a public document. It is a collection I have had made of all the speeches, printed in one volume.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be a good thing to have it printed as a public document.

OFFICE SPACE FOR DISTRICT RENT COMMISSION.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an item that appeared in the Washington Post this morning. It reads as follows:

RENT BOARD OFFICE FAILS TO SATISFY—LOCATION WILL HAMPER WORK ON HOUSING, SAYS COMMISSIONER MASON.

With more than 1,000,000 square feet of floor space available in the Government office buildings in Washington, Guy Mason, of the District Rent Commission, declared yesterday the choice of the rear of the fifth floor of the Hooe Building, 1330 F Street N.W., for the commission's office was an outrage to the public, which has been awaiting anxiously for the rent commission to find a speedy remedy for the rent situation here. The commissioners hope to find a building more suited to their purposes.

"The commissioners are extremely anxious to attack the housing problem in Washington," said Mr. Mason, "and the Public Buildings Commission, of which Senator REED SMOOT is chairman, has placed an additional obstacle in our way by assigning us to offices which will not be ready for occupancy for two or three weeks, and when ready their position on the fifth floor of the building will become an added inconvenience when large numbers of complainants start coming to lay their cases before the commissioners in person."

The commission must pay for occupancy and lighting expenses 83 cents a square foot of the 3,200 square feet allotted in the Hooe Building, according to Mr. Mason.

I am not acquainted with Mr. Mason, but there is scarcely a word of truth in that article. If that newspaper report is true, I can only say if that is the kind of a rent commissioner we have in the District of Columbia as far as he is concerned the renters need not expect results of a practical nature, but will receive false and sensational statements through the public press.

In the act creating the Public Buildings Commission following is the authority granted:

Said commission shall have the absolute control of and the allotment of all space in the several public buildings owned or buildings leased by the United States in the District of Columbia, with the exception of the Executive Mansion and office of the President, Capitol Building, the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Capitol power plant, the buildings under the jurisdiction of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Congressional Library Building, and shall from time to time assign and allot, for the use of the several activities of the Government, all such space.

In the first place, I wish to say that if Mr. Guy Mason made the statement that there are a million square feet of space in the Government buildings in the District of Columbia available, it is an absolute falsehood.

Mr. President, the Rent Commission applied to the Public Buildings Commission for space in some Government building. The authority of that commission is only to allot space for the use of the several activities of the Government. The commission has no power whatever to allot space to activities of the government of the District of Columbia. That question has been referred to the counsel of several of the departments, and the commission received opinions to the effect that the law did not authorize the Public Buildings Commission to assign space for the activities of government in the different departments of the District of Columbia.

If the commission had the authority to assign space for the Rent Commission of the District of Columbia, it would also have authority to assign space for all the activities of the District, and that the commission has not the power to do.

This is what the commission did do when the Rent Commission made an application for space in a Government building. I knew that there were some 3,200 square feet of space in the Hooe Building that was not being occupied to-day, although the Treasury Department had to pay rent for the whole of the space in the building, and I suggested to the rent commissioners of the District of Columbia that if they desired to occupy that space and would pay their pro rata of the rent of the whole building, the Public Buildings Commission would have no objection whatever to their use of the same.

Mr. Sinclair, a member of the commission, together with Mr. Roper, the secretary of the commission, went with the secretary of the Public Buildings Commission and examined that space, and Mr. Sinclair reported to the other members of the Rent Commission of the District of Columbia that the space named was unoccupied and that the commission could occupy it if they paid the same rental per foot as the Treasury Department was paying for the building. On a vote of the commission they

accepted the proposition and said they would move into the Hooe Building upon the terms offered. Now comes a member of the commission in a public statement, as already read by me, which is untrue in nearly every respect.

Not only that, but he is complaining about paying 83 cents a square foot for the rent and lighting of the building, and I ask upon what ground? Take business property in the business section of the District of Columbia anywhere near the Hooe Building and the prices which are being charged to-day per square foot for rent run from \$1.50 to as high as \$3.50.

So, Mr. President, all the Public Buildings Commission has done in this matter has been to call to the attention of the Rent Commission of the District of Columbia, following its application for space, the fact that there were 3,200 square feet in the Hooe Building that the Government was not occupying at the present time, and that if the commission wanted the use of it, it could do so by paying exactly what the Treasury of the United States to-day is paying per square foot for the space they occupy in the building.

I simply call these facts to the attention of the Senate in the hope that such uncalled for and untruthful statements will not again be made by a member of the Rent Commission of the District of Columbia. I can not understand the motive. The Public Buildings Commission to-day is consolidating every department of the Government in just as compact form as possible. We have been trying for the last two or three weeks to make room, as I stated to the Senate the other day, for the 1,700 employees of the Fleet Corporation, which is now located in Philadelphia, and I think we have accomplished that purpose by transfers and consolidations. When Mr. Guy Mason makes the statement that there are a million square feet of space in the Government buildings which are now unoccupied, it is an absolute untruth.

FOREIGN LOANS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, as it seems that we have done so much printing and desire to be so economical, I wish to call attention to a few lines that I read with great interest yesterday afternoon, showing that we have now due us on our European loans \$325,000,000 of interest; that none of the accrued interest on the loans has been paid; and that the plan is to defer for a few years the collection of any of the interest. I ask to have printed in the RECORD the amount of the interest due to the United States on these loans by each of the countries to whom the loans have been made. Great Britain, for example, owes us \$144,440,837.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, does that mean the amount of interest due? That does not include the principal?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The interest due is the amount I mentioned. I started by saying that I was calling attention to the interest due on these loans, none of which has been paid, and I understand the proposition is to defer for several years the payment of any of the interest.

I regard this as a matter of very general public interest and a matter of information that is not generally known. I wish to have a memorandum of each of the items of interest printed in the RECORD.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I should like to ask him a question. Has any interest been paid by any government on any of the indebtedness?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. As I am advised, no interest has been paid by any of the countries to whom the loan has been made.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, some time ago I had inserted in the RECORD a statement which I think is the same one that the Senator saw in the paper yesterday. It was copied, if I remember correctly, from the New York World. I call the Senator's attention, if he has not noticed it—I did not notice it myself until this morning—to the fact that on page 2232 of the RECORD of the proceedings of yesterday the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] had placed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post, giving all this detail, together with the advice of the Secretary of the Treasury in relation to the entire matter, not only as to how we shall finance the moneys that foreign powers have borrowed from us, but the policy of the department as to further aid to Europe and as to related subjects; and on page 2233, in the first column, appears an itemized statement of the amount of interest due to us from other countries. I do not say this in derogation of anything the Senator has just put in the RECORD, but I call his attention to the fact that it is by authority of the Treasury Department.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And it was inserted yesterday?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, Mr. President, I do not care to publish the figures again.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I suggest to the Senator that he leave it in the RECORD, because I do not think the attention of the country can be called to it too frequently.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If there is no objection, I will ask to have published the brief statement that I handed in; and I do wish that the most general knowledge of this situation might go throughout the country. It may relieve the minds of some of those who still are disturbed upon the theory that we have done nothing for European countries, and who urge that the responsibility is still on us to do something for them, lest we might be considered slackers in our treatment of European interests.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

\$325,000,000 DUE UNITED STATES FROM EUROPE ON LOANS.

"Accrued interest on loans to European countries totals approximately \$325,000,000, according to a table submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee by the Treasury Department, which plans to defer collection for a few years pending reconstruction.

"Great Britain owes the most interest, the total on loans to that country being \$144,440,837. Interest owed by other countries is: France, \$94,021,749; Italy, \$54,256,589; Russia, \$16,832,662; Belgium, \$11,465,278; Czechoslovakia \$1,667,083; Serbia, \$917,299; Roumania, \$609,873; and Liberia, \$548."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the Senator advised us that the plan was to defer the payment of this interest.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The article I have placed in the RECORD states the plan is to defer for a few years interest collections.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Will the Senator tell us from what source the suggestion comes?

Mr. SMOOT. Why, from the Treasury Department.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. So I understood in this article.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Treasury Department is advising the further deferment of the payment of the interest?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield. I have not any definite information upon that subject, but the statement in this article was that the Treasury Department planned to defer for a few years the collection of interest.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question about it, Mr. President. That is the recommendation of the Treasury Department, and I wish to say to the Senator that in some cases it could not be otherwise. I am not going at this time into the particular instances; but in the case of a good many of the countries, if we were insisting upon it, the Government of the United States would simply have to advance to them the money to pay the interest. That, however, is not the case with Great Britain and some of the other large countries.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, it is quite likely that interest will have to be deferred on the loans to some of these weaker countries. What I am now seeking information in regard to is whether the purpose or the recommendation of the department is to defer the interest upon all of these loans—for instance, to France and Great Britain and Italy—for an indefinite time?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I only saw the published statement of the purpose. I can not think it is true; I felt that public attention should be brought to it. If there is a purpose of that character anywhere it is entitled to public attention, and I think it should be abandoned except in cases where payment of interest is impossible.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I prosecuted this inquiry because it was disclosed in the consideration of the so-called New bill, to establish a department of aeronautics, that a number of the European countries which are so deeply indebted to us, and so straitened financially that they are unable to pay us the interest upon their loans, are engaged in most ambitious and highly expensive projects to increase their air forces and their air equipment for military purposes. In other words, as it was quite appropriately expressed in the course of the debate, they are carrying on a great program of military organization with money that is furnished them by the United States.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly.

Mr. KING. That statement has been made a number of times upon the floor of the Senate. I have before me the testimony of Secretary Baker before the Military Affairs Committee when his attention was challenged to the statement that Great Britain had a budget of \$300,000,000 for aircraft for the current year. Secretary Baker denied that, upon the information which he had, and said that the greater part of it was in liquidation of obligations which had been incurred. My infor-

mation is that neither Great Britain nor France is undertaking any very elaborate aircraft production program, and yet, of course, both Great Britain and France are in such a situation that perhaps their needs for aircraft defense are more important than those of this country.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I spoke of this because I listened with some interest to the address of the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] the other day, in which he sought to impress the Senate and the country with the idea that we were lagging away behind other countries in aircraft production and in the development of aircraft for military purposes, and that was urged as a reason for the speedy passage of the bill to which I have referred.

Mr. KING. I have no doubt that military and naval officers in Great Britain and France and Italy had very ambitious programs for aircraft production; but those programs have not been carried into effect, and will not be carried into effect. My information is that Great Britain will not expend to exceed \$50,000,000 for new aircraft production, but that the great amount that has been mentioned is in liquidation of contracts which heretofore have been entered into.

While I have the floor I desire to make a brief statement concerning our trade relations with Europe and to refer briefly to the statement made by the Senator from Georgia. There seems to be a determined effort upon the part of some American newspapers to mislead the American people concerning the financial and commercial relations between the United States and European countries. Whenever any suggestion is made that the people of Europe should receive financial help, there are some newspapers as well as certain elements in our country that immediately assert that Europe is attempting to deprive the American people of their money and to inflict a serious injury upon us.

Some of the same newspapers are earnestly urging an extension of our commerce with other nations, and criticize with more or less virulence Great Britain when information is forthcoming that that nation is opening up commercial fields in South America and in other countries. There are some in our midst who are constantly denouncing European nations because they owe us, and the purpose seems to be to create an impression in the United States that these obligations have been improperly incurred and that our country has been robbed to the extent of billions of dollars by our allies as well as other European nations.

Before the war our annual exports to Europe were approximately \$2,000,000,000, and our entire foreign commerce in 1913 was nearly four and a quarter billions. As the war progressed our exports greatly increased and our foreign trade became so stupendous as to be beyond our comprehension. Our exports during 1918 were nearly \$6,000,000,000 and our foreign trade passed the \$7,000,000,000 mark. For 1919 our foreign commerce was approximately \$10,000,000,000. It is manifest to the dullest student of political economy that this enormous foreign commerce resulted from the extension of credits not only by the Government but by individuals and corporations to foreign purchasers. The money loaned by our Government to our allies, and to other European nations, amounting to approximately \$10,000,000,000, did not consist of the actual physical transfer of gold and silver to Europe. Credits were extended to European nations, and these credits were absorbed in paying for surplus American products. Billions of dollars of domestic products were marketed abroad. The products of field and farm and mill and mine were purchased by the peoples of Europe through the credits which we enabled them to obtain. At the beginning of the war we were a debtor Nation. Europe exhausted most of her American securities and lost a large part of her gold supply in paying for surplus products produced in the United States. If our Government had not loaned money to Europe, if credit had not been provided for our allies and other European nations, the surplus products of our own country would have filled to overflowing the terminals, warehouses, and granaries of our country. Prices would have rapidly declined. Labor would have been thrown out of employment and financial disaster would have overtaken us.

So when we criticize Europe for having obtained credits in the United States we are closing our eyes to the immense benefits which the American people derived from the transactions.

Mr. Vanderlip and others who have visited Europe have explained in the clearest possible terms the precarious financial situation there existing. The supply of gold is limited. Most of the European nations are without credit. They are burdened with such stupendous obligations as a result of the war that it is almost impossible for them to obtain credit. There is a lack of raw materials, and all Europe is so burdened as the result of the war that it is difficult, and, in many instances impossible, for the people to engage in manufacturing activities or to

undertake the enterprises which formerly brought them work and prosperity. It is unwise to close our eyes to the bankrupt condition of Europe. The condition is such that we can not gloss it over. We are not cut off from Europe in a commercial or financial way; and no one desires that there shall be a complete severance of all business and commercial dealings between this Nation and European countries. Our prosperity is dependent to a large degree upon our exports and upon our foreign trade. If we neither import nor export, a complete business paralysis would soon ensue.

American business men are now penetrating every civilized land for the purpose of obtaining foreign markets for the surplus products of our country. We have built up a merchant marine in order to increase our commercial activity in the world. If our factories and mills are to continue their production, if our farms and fields and mines are to continue to yield their rich rewards, there must be markets found in all corners of the globe. Our flag must be seen in every port, and American goods and products must find purchasers and consumers in the remotest isles of the world. Europe has always been our chief foreign market, and Great Britain and her colonies were purchasing before the war, as I recall, considerably more than 50 per cent of our exports. Instead of criticizing and denouncing Europe because of her obligations to us and her inability to meet immediate interest payments, we ought to be devising plans by which we may extend our trade, increase our exports, and, while helping Europe, obtain legitimate and proper benefits for ourselves.

My attention was recently called to Poland's needs for American products. Representatives from Poland sought to purchase in this country engines and steel products for railroad construction. She did not have sufficient gold with which to make payment. Her boundaries were still undetermined, and she lacked that stability to make her bonds or her securities inviting to American manufacturers. It is clear that if arrangements could have been made by which the desired products could have been supplied to Poland, it would have been of great advantage to that new nation, and it would have been advantageous not only to the steel mills of the United States but to the laboring men, the producers of coal, and the merchants and others living in the section where the steel goods would have been manufactured.

The former Secretary of Commerce called my attention a short time ago to the fact that representatives from one of the agricultural States had visited him for the purpose of having arrangements made, if it were possible to do so, by which one of the European nations could obtain credits in order to purchase 100,000 horses from farmers in the State referred to. The European nation needed the horses and the agriculturists in the State mentioned were desirous of selling them. If the transaction could have been completed the farmers of the United States would have benefited, and, of course, the nation in Europe in need of the horses would have been benefited.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. PHELAN. I have been trying to follow the Senator and desire to interrupt him simply to ask whether he approves of the policy of advancing money out of the Treasury in order to stimulate the sale of American goods?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, that question is not involved in the point I am endeavoring to make, but I have no objection to answering the Senator. When we entered the war it was imperative that we do everything possible to win the war. Our allies needed money and credit, and in aiding them by extending credits we were contributing to the defeat of the enemy and were materially aiding in winning the war. However, I think the time has come when the Government of the United States can no longer continue this policy of loaning to European nations. This is a general statement. It is possible that some contingency might arise which would call for a loan to some European nation. We in common with our allies have promised the peoples of Poland and Czechoslovakia and the Jugo-Slavic State that they should have independence. It is possible that a situation so acute might develop as to call for aid to be extended to one or more of these States by this Government and some of the allied and associated powers. Indeed, I feel that there ought to be some concerted effort by the allied and associated powers to strengthen these new States against the Bolshevist tide. If they should be destroyed no one could predict what the effect would be not only upon Europe but upon the United States. In the interest of our own peace and to prevent the recurrence of war, we might feel compelled to loan money to some European nation.

But I have had in mind in the observations which I have submitted the extension of credits to the peoples of Europe by

the American people themselves and not by the Government. I might also add that the situation of the people in some parts of Europe is such that the Government of the United States might properly make some advances to prevent millions from starvation and death. The distress in certain portions of Europe is beyond our power to comprehend. Poverty, disease, starvation, and death are destroying entire sections and depopulating great cities. The cries of the starving women and children should not be in vain. And, notwithstanding charity begins at home, it would be to our everlasting discredit if we did not look with profound sympathy upon the sufferings of the people of Europe and if we did not attempt in every possible way to alleviate their distress.

Mr. PHELAN. I will pursue the inquiry when the Senator from Utah is through.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I only want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that Poland is not one of those who owe us any interest. Austria is not one of those who owe us any interest. The suggestion would be that some of the interest due from Great Britain might be paid to us, and we could loan it to them if we saw fit. They are certainly taking care of their business everywhere, all over Europe and even in Russia.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not recall what nations have failed to pay the interest due the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. All of them.

Mr. KING. I am speaking in a general way of the conditions which caused the European indebtedness. We had a surplus of agricultural and manufactured products, as well as raw materials, and the nations of Europe were compelled to have them. They became purchasers and we vendors; the transactions were highly favorable to the American people and enabled Europe to prosecute the war and to feed her soldiers and civilians.

Mr. President, we might as well recognize the fact that we are the great creditor nation of the world, and if we continue to do business with Europe we will be compelled to extend credits to her for many years to come. Our bankers and business men must recognize this situation and provide the needed credits. The American people will be compelled to become European investors. There must be a market developed in the United States for European securities. Some of our surplus capital must take the form of foreign securities, and the stocks and bonds of Europe must be absorbed to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars among the American investing public. This we will be compelled to do, whether we desire to or not, if we continue to trade with Europe. For our own good we must trade; therefore we will be required to take in payment for our products the only thing Europe has at present, viz, evidences of indebtedness and the best form of securities that can be furnished. We all remember that a few years ago we sold our securities in Europe. We settled the balance of trade against us with American securities. We built railroads with money from Holland and France and other European nations, and European capital was employed to develop our country, build our factories, and promote the welfare and prosperity of the country. Now that we are a creditor nation we will be compelled to convert the obligations of Europe into European investments, and so become capitalists in Europe.

If Europe continues to trade with the United States, she must have something to place in the balance. She has no goods or gold with which to settle her balances. There is only one other thing which will enable her to deal with us, and that is credit. The manufacturers in Germany or France or Poland must have raw materials. We have raw materials as well as finished products for sale. For our own good, as well as for the welfare of the sorrowing people of Europe, we must extend to them the necessary credits. This is a time for broad and statesmanlike vision.

Nationalism does not mean isolation, and national prosperity will not be promoted by oppressing or crushing the nations by which we are surrounded.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, the Senator, in answer to my question, said that he was not favoring, as I had understood from his remarks, advancing Treasury money for the rehabilitation of European governments and industries. When the money was advanced out of the Treasury—the proceeds of the sale of bonds—to certain European countries, it developed, and the record will show it, that the money advanced by the United States released their own money, which otherwise would have been employed in the purchase of munitions of war, and their money thus released was employed in the establishment of their industries, which were in competition with our own; and the

rather ridiculous situation developed that, for instance, England out of its abundance provided for industries, such as the dye industry, which we at the very same time were endeavoring to establish by the levying of a tariff.

Of course, the surplus supplies of the United States were sold to European countries, and possibly a general benefit accrued to the people; but more particularly a special benefit accrued to those who had war munitions for sale, because it was principally in war munitions that the trade was carried on. But to take the money levied on the property of the people and the incomes of the people and to give it to Europe for commercial and industrial rehabilitation I think is entirely unjustified.

I believe that Mr. Hoover himself, a very benevolent gentleman, said that the remedy to-day was to tell Europe to go to work, and as long as we provided funds there would be a danger of pauperizing Europe, and the habit of work would be lost; and this great, big, and rich Nation, therefore, in the interest of Europe, should refrain from coddling industries when the people have within themselves the power, as we know they have had in other generations, to recuperate and to recover their lost industries.

I have had petitions—and that is why I particularly took the floor at this moment—from constituents in California who have advanced the idea that we went to war for the purpose of establishing a new order of liberty and democracy, where people would be given the right to govern themselves, and where the old autocratic ideas would be, so far as we were able, abolished, and that self-determination would be given to all the people. Now, the protestants in the petitions which I have received say that inasmuch as the Senate has refused in any form to agree to a covenant of a League of Nations by which the countries would be guaranteed in the rights for which we went to war—liberty, democracy, self-determination, and justice—we have to that extent failed in the war; we have not realized our ideals; we have accomplished nothing; and it is a matter of the highest duty to ourselves to refrain from giving money to Europe for the continuation of the old order, because they are simply re-erecting governments on the same foundations, and nothing else. And because America is not there to protect the rights for which she strove as a moderator, as a great moral force, the whole scheme of a reorganized world is in the hands of the very nations that have in the past perpetuated the evils and the wrongs of which the petitioners complain.

So I am opposed to advancing money to Europe for rehabilitation, because it is not being reestablished in the right lines. I am opposed on the further ground that the people of this country are carrying unprecedented burdens, and that charity does begin at home. I think a mistake economically would be made if we should do anything tending to pauperize Europe, and prevent her, so far as our charity and benevolence are concerned, from looking to her own resources, looking to her own ability, and throwing herself upon her own capacity. As long as she is coddled, as long as she is considered decrepit, ill, ailing, as Europe always considered Turkey, for instance, "the sick man of the East"; as long as she is put in that light in our eyes, and led to believe, from our solicitude for her welfare, that she is unable to help herself, she will remain helpless.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator before he takes his seat?

Mr. PHELAN. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator says that he is opposed to loaning any further money to European countries. Does the Senator think he is likely to be asked to give his consent, or may it not be loaned without asking the consent of Congress?

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator's inquiry is very pertinent. I remember an inquiry at one time during the period when we had little information and everybody was in favor of action rather than talk as to whether our advances to Europe were secured; and I have failed to learn—in fact, I know to the contrary now—that any security was given for any class of loans at any time.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. From the statement that was printed in the Record yesterday as having been made by the Secretary of the Treasury, it appears that since the armistice was signed the Treasury has made direct cash advances of \$2,330,891,000 to the Allied Governments. If we have loaned that much since the armistice was signed, what is to prevent a further loan of \$150,000,000, which is a mere bagatelle, in comparison, without appealing to the Senator for any consent?

Mr. PHELAN. I am well aware of that, Mr. President. Of course, those advances were made pursuant to authority given by Congress to the executive department. Hence, the advances are perfectly regular. What shall Congress do now is the question?

Mr. OVERMAN. It ought to be stated that in the communication the Secretary of the Treasury said he is opposed to advancing any more money. His statement is that—

Relative to the solution of the exchange puzzle, Mr. Glass warned that this country could not continue to extend credits on a sufficient scale to cover the present swollen trade balances while paying cash (gold and silver) to Latin-American and Far Eastern traders.

So it is not his policy to advance any more money.

Mr. PHELAN. I have not read the article to which the Senator refers, but if it is not the policy of the Treasury, although it has the power to advance the money, then the Senate will not be called upon to give its consent. I notice the appeal to the House by the Treasury Department is for money for the relief of starving people. That is another phase of the same subject. We ought to be very well advised as to the necessity of that relief before we give it. But "all mankind's concern is charity," and, of course, we are all disposed to be very charitable with other people's money.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PHELAN. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The Senator, of course, realizes that the prosperity of the United States largely depends upon finding foreign markets for the surplus products of our people. The Senator knows that for years we have been interested in trying to obtain a merchant marine, so that we could compete, in part at least, with European nations. The Senator knows that unless we do finance Europe, in a way, Europe will be unable to purchase the products of which we have a surplus. I am not in favor of the Government financing Europe, but obviously the manufacturers, the agriculturists, those who have surplus products in the United States who must find markets abroad, must make some provision to aid those who need these products and want to buy them, to effectuate the purchases; and in order to do that American capitalists will be compelled to purchase European securities, and with those European securities Europe, in turn, will be able to finance herself to the extent of purchasing those things of which we have a surplus. Our prosperity depends upon the prosperity of Europe. If Europe becomes bankrupt and her nations fall into chaos and ruin and her entire financial system goes to wreck, it will react disadvantageously upon America, and our men will be turned out of shops and mills and our surplus products will be piled in factories, in granaries, and in terminals, and we will have financial ruin here in the United States.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the point made by the Senator from Utah, that there is an absolute necessity for the maintenance of our commerce and our merchant fleet to have the countries of the world exchange their commodities with ours, and therefore he argues we should have a care to see that the European Governments are restored to their pristine ability to engage in such trade.

There are other countries of the world besides Europe, whose trade is not embarrassed, and whose industries may or may not have to be aided by American money. The Senator is perfectly right in saying that it is legitimate for American financiers to provide that money, based upon the merits of the enterprise. That is the great field of finance just as the other is the great field of commerce.

But what I am arguing against is the free advancing of the money in the Treasury which belongs to all the people and which the people of the United States have to provide, and, by the payment of interest, have to bear a burden for untold generations. That money should not be advanced by the Government, but Europe should be the object of the enterprise and the encouragement of our financial institutions.

There is a case in point which the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] will appreciate. The city of San Francisco was utterly destroyed in 1906 by fire. There was a loss of probably \$600,000,000 in that small area of 47 square miles. A committee consisting of the Federal judge and the president of the University of California came to Congress and, for the restoration of San Francisco, they asked that Congress guarantee bonds to be issued by the city, because, on account of the fire, the city's credit was utterly lost and she had no ability to go into the financial market and get money on her own securities, and therefore they prayed Congress like a good father to indorse the obligations of the city of Federal importance located at the Golden Gate.

What did Congress do? I thought at that time that Congress had no feeling of interest in this great Federal city by the Golden Gate because it refused. It said: Let the great city by the Golden Gate rehabilitate herself. At that time we were told that it would take five years to clear the debris which was on the streets of San Francisco. Two hundred and fifty thousand people were in the bread lines. San Francisco came to the money markets of the East and financed herself, and it was very good for San Francisco that Congress had refused to

give her any artificial support because she was thrown on her own resources. The financiers of the East, after they had overcome their alarm about a recurrence of such a disaster in San Francisco, due to the fear of seismic disturbances, timidly at first and then in competition with each other, very generously at last advanced the money at normal rates of interest.

There is a parallel. San Francisco is better for her self-sufficiency and her self-reliance, and Europe's growth will be more permanent and enduring and the people of Europe will be able better to maintain their self-respect by not leaning upon America. The financiers of America shall do the work of rehabilitation on a business basis, and the Government of America shall look after the internal concerns of the people and see that the great burden of taxation which they bear now is speedily reduced, and one of the best ways of doing it is to collect our interest from Europe, for down in the stockings of Europe we know there is money, because the world to-day, France and England particularly, is exploiting industries and natural resources. Witness Persia, Mesopotamia, Mexico, and South America, where oil exploitation is going on with money which should be put into the United States Treasury in payment of the enormous advances which we made as necessary to preserve the very existence of those countries; and now they are going into foreign fields and interfering with our trade by reason of our bounty.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. PHELAN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] suggests the importance of commercial advances to Europe. Does it not occur to the Senator from California that some attention to collecting the interest due on the advances we have made would encourage commercial interests to make loans in Europe? The feeling that those who make a loan are to get their interest is essential to a loan. I fear we are setting a bad precedent.

Mr. PHELAN. Unless in forma pauperis, the European nations have no reason to ask our indulgence. If they are broke, we can not get blood out of a turnip; but I say they are using their money in the great continents of the world for the purpose of securing raw materials, and largely petroleum oil, with the end in view of commanding the commerce of the world, because oil absolutely determines who shall be the carriers upon the sea and ultimately who shall be the industrial winners of the world's trade. Oil is the fuel which can most economically be used, and in competition with oil burners it is impossible for a coal-burning merchant marine to exist. To-day we are importing petroleum. We consume more than we produce, and when we get into the foreign fields we are told very frankly—and the evidence is in the RECORD from Mr. Manning and Mr. Doheny—that England is there first. Why should we indulge that payment of interest when that money which is ours is used against our larger interests in the world of commerce and trade and of war, because a naval craft has a larger radius of sailing and has greater capacity for munitions if she has only oil to carry for the purpose of her propulsion. An oil burner will win against a coal burner, and that is why those nations are feverishly exploring the oil supplies of the world. Let them pay their bills before they indulge in the luxury of acquiring new sources of raw materials which will probably be the determining factor in the ultimate conflict in this world which is sure to come, perhaps not in our time, for commercial greatness and national supremacy.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, what is the order of business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The good of the world, I think.

Mr. SMOOT. Let us have the regular order until we get through with the morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Petitions and memorials are in order.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 5.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent that—

Whereas there is a long stretch of coast dangerous to shipping lying between Bandon, Ore., and the Humboldt Bay in northern California, entirely unprotected by life-saving station between said points; and

Whereas the Cape Blanco Reef, the Port Orford Reef, and the Rogue River Reef, on the Oregon coast, are a particular menace to the safety of shipping; and

Whereas in the past, owing to the lack of life-saving facilities in the vicinity of these reefs, a great number of lives have been lost from vessels being wrecked upon these reefs; and
Whereas Port Orford, in Curry County, State of Oregon, is a proper, efficient, and convenient place upon said coast for the location of a life-saving station so located as to be available to give aid to shipwrecks occurring upon either of the above-named reefs: Be it
Resolved, That your memorialists respectfully and earnestly petition and request the Congress of the United States to use all just means to cause a life-saving station to be installed and maintained at the port of Port Orford, in Curry County, Oreg.

Adopted by the house January 16, 1920.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate January 14, 1920.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.
By Senator I. S. Smith.
J. W. COCHRAN, *Chief Clerk.*

Indorsed: Senate joint memorial No. 5.
Filed January 16, 1920.

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 5 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon at the special session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon January 12-17, 1920, and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 16, 1920, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.
Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 20th day of January, A. D. 1920.

[SEAL.] BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 3.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully request that—

Whereas loss of timber through forest fires in Oregon and other Northwestern States is detrimental to public welfare, and threatens the permanency of our principal manufacturing industry; and
Whereas use of airplanes furnished by the War Department for patrol of forested areas in Oregon and California the past season aided materially in the work of forest protection; and
Whereas the department air-service officer, Western Department, has submitted a report to the War Department outlining a plan for air patrol of forested areas in the States of Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, and western Wyoming; and

Whereas the States above mentioned embrace some 80,000,000 acres of Government-owned forest land and contain fully one-half of all the standing merchantable timber in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That our Representatives and Senators in Congress be, and are hereby, memorialized and requested to use their best endeavors to secure approval of the recommendations of the department air-service officer, Western Department, for patrol of our forests by airplanes during the 1920 season, and also to provide the Federal Forest Service necessary funds to enable proper cooperation with the air service in order that the maximum benefit may be secured through air patrol.

Adopted by the house January 13, 1920.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate January 15, 1920.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 3. Introduced by Mr. W. V. Fuller.

Filed January 16, 1920.

W. F. DRAGER, *Chief Clerk.*
BEN W. OLCOTT, *Secretary of State.*
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 3 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon at the special session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon January 12-17, 1920, and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 16, 1920, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.
Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 20th day of January, A. D. 1920.

[SEAL.] BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.
There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 4.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that—

Whereas lying east of the Cascade Mountains and within the boundaries of Klamath County, Oreg., is the Klamath Indian Reservation, a territory some 40 miles square and containing \$20,000,000 worth of standing pine timber at the present selling price, which will, at the rapid advancement in the value of timber, double in the next few years; and
Whereas in addition to said timber there is a vast number of acres of hay and pasture land, the body known as the big marsh contains about a hundred thousand acres, that a large number of artesian wells located on said last-mentioned tract and large quantities of hay are cut each year; and

Whereas there are now on said reservation eleven hundred Indians, the number of Indians on said reservation not having varied to any appreciable extent for about 15 years; and

Whereas the opening of this reservation would immediately add to the assessment roll of Klamath County more than \$30,000,000 of property and make Klamath County the second county in the State in relation to assessed valuation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives concurring, That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon favors the immediate opening of the said Klamath Indian Reservation for settlement, preference right of acquiring said lands for settlement being given to those who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the war between the United States and Germany, the Spanish-American War, or the Philippine insurrection, and have been honorably discharged or separated therefrom or placed in the Regular Army or Naval Reserve; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior Department of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Oregon in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house January 17, 1920.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate January 15, 1920.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Indorsed: Senate joint memorial No. 4. By Senator Baldwin.

J. W. COCHRAN, *Chief Clerk.*

Filed January 17, 1920.

BEN W. OLCOTT, *Secretary of State.*
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of Senate joint memorial No. 4 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon at the special session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon January 12-17, 1920, and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 17, 1920, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 20th day of January, A. D. 1920.

[SEAL.] BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.
There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial.

Whereas the thirtieth regular session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, by an act filed in the office of the secretary of state March 4, 1919, and being chapter 345, general laws of Oregon, 1919, referred to the people of the State of Oregon for their ratification or rejection at the special election held on Tuesday, the 3d day of June, 1919, an act appropriating the sum of \$2,500,000 to be paid to the United States for the purpose of assisting the United States in constructing a military highway to be known as the Roosevelt Coast Military Highway, from the city of Astoria through Clatsop, Tillamook, Lincoln, Lane, Douglas, Coos, and Curry Counties of the State of Oregon to the California State line, and for the purchase of rights of way and property necessary and convenient therefor, to be owned and maintained by the United States, contingent, however, upon the United States appropriating from any fund the sum of at least \$2,500,000 for the same purposes; and

Whereas at said special election there were two to one legal and effective votes cast in favor of such measure; and

Whereas said measure became and is now a valid and effective law of the State of Oregon; and

Whereas there is now no adequate military protection for the 400 miles of coast line of the State of Oregon along the Pacific Ocean, and there are but four or five available passes from the interior to the coast and no available communication from place to place along the coast without the construction of a highway such as is proposed; and

Whereas the United States Government is still the owner of several millions of acres of timberlands in forest reserves and which lie between the summit of the coast range and the coast line, and which will increase in value by the construction of the Roosevelt coast military highway and the opening and development of the State of Oregon caused thereby, in many times the total appropriation requested from the United States; and

Whereas no appropriation made by the United States Government for forest roads in national forests in other sections will compare with the financial benefit which will accrue to the United States by the opening and development of the lands owned by the Federal Government through the construction of the proposed highway along the Oregon coast; and

Whereas many thousands of acres of the richest land in the State lie in the numberless valleys along the coast between the summit of the coast range and the ocean, which can only be developed by a north-and-south road connecting the communities, and further developed by local roads leading from the trunk road up the valleys; and

Whereas the coast country has and is now contributing through the organization of port districts to the improvement and development of navigation to the benefit of the Nation, and has already paid out and expended approximately \$8,000,000 for these purposes; and

Whereas the Nation owes a duty to its soldiers, sailors, and marines in the Great War against Germany and her allies to provide lands and homes, which through the development of the country by building roads and otherwise may be in some small measure a partly adequate compensation for the great work they have performed; and

Whereas the wonderful beauty of the Pacific coast along the Oregon shore line is a priceless heritage to the Nation, which should be fostered and made available to the countless millions in this country, aside from the great financial gain which will accrue to the Nation and the State by the building of this highway and apart from the just demand for military protection along this unprotected coast: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives concurring), That we hereby memorialize Congress to enact suitable legislation to match the appropriation offered to the National Government by the State of Oregon for the building of a national road, and which will be an everlasting monument to the memory of one of the greatest Americans of our time, our late lamented, much loved ex-President Roosevelt, the scholar, the statesman, and the soldier.

Adopted by the house January 15, 1920.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate January 13, 1920.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Indorsed: Senate joint memorial No. 2. By Senator I. S. Smith,
J. W. COCHRAN,
Chief Clerk.

Filed January 15, 1920.

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of Senate joint memorial No. 2 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon at the special session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon January 12-17, 1920, and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 15, 1920, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon. In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Ore., this 20th day of January, A. D. 1920.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 1.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that—

Believing that a race of people who are by the laws of the land not entitled to become citizens of the United States by naturalization, and who are permitted to remain in the United States for business and trade purposes, the children of such aliens should retain the citizenship of their parents; and

Believing that if there is reason for excluding the parents from naturalization, such disqualification should extend to the offspring of such parents; and

Believing that the theory of our system of government and our application of such theory should be the same; and

Believing that the people who choose the men to make, enforce, and interpret our laws should be capable of acquiring citizenship and not have it imposed upon them by the accident of the place of birth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House concurring), That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon favors the submission by Congress to the legislatures of the several States a proposed amendment to the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, so that such amendment shall provide, when amended, that children born in the United States, or in territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof, and whose parents are not citizens and can not under existing laws acquire citizenship by naturalization, shall retain the citizenship of the parents and shall not become citizens by reason of birth in the United States or in territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

Be it further resolved, That upon the adoption of this joint memorial the secretary of state of the State of Oregon transmit copies thereof to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by the house January 16, 1920.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate January 13, 1920.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Indorsed: Senate joint memorial 1. By Senator Patterson.

J. W. COCHRAN,
Chief Clerk.

Filed January 16, 1920.

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of Senate joint memorial 1 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon at the special session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon January 12-17, 1920, and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 16, 1920, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom, and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Ore., this 20th day of January, A. D. 1920.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial 6.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

That whereas Congressman SINNOTT, of the third congressional district of the State of Oregon, has introduced a bill which is now pending in the Congress of the United States, having for its purpose the restoration to entry of certain lands in Klamath County, Ore., which provides:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"SECTION 1. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to determine and make public announcement of what lands in and around Upper Klamath Lake, in Klamath County, Ore., ceded to the United States by the State of Oregon by an act entitled "An act to authorize the utilization of Upper Klamath Lake, Lower or Little Klamath Lake, and Tule or Rhett Lake, situate in Klamath County, Ore., and Goose Lake, situate in Lake County, Ore., in connection with the irrigation and reclamation operations of the Reclamation Service of the United States, and to cede to the United States all the right, title, interest, and claim of the State of Oregon to any and all lands recovered by the lowering of the water levels or by the drainage of any or all of said lands" (General Laws of Oregon, 1905, p. 63), may be uncovered and opened to agricultural development by drainage or diking, not impairing the use of the portions of said lake which do not cover title or marsh lands for storage of water or irrigation in connection with the Klamath reclamation project.

"SEC. 2. That title to all said lands can be acquired by homestead entry under the general homestead laws and the provisions of this act, and not otherwise. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to permit any drainage district organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, or any person or corporation, to dike or drain said lands at a cost to be fixed by said Secretary, and to have a lien on said lands as security for the payment of the cost of said drainage or diking. That residence and improvement on said lands by entryman shall not be required until his entry shall have been drained.

"SEC. 3. That those who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the war between the United States and Germany, the Spanish-American War, or the Philippine Insurrection, and have been honorably discharged or separated therefrom and prior right to file upon and enter said lands under the homestead laws and the provisions of this act for a period of six months following the time said lands are opened to entry. That in opening said lands for homestead entry the Secretary of the Interior shall provide for the disposition thereof to said soldiers, sailors, and marines in one 160-acre tract to each entryman, by drawing, under general rules and regulations to be promulgated by him: *Provided,* That the rights and benefits conferred by this act shall not extend to any person who, having been drafted for service under the provisions of the selective-service act, shall have refused to render such service or to wear the uniform of such service of the United States.

"SEC. 4. That said lands shall not be leased or otherwise disposed of except under the provisions of this act, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon favors the passage by Congress of said bill, and to that end the Representatives and Senators in the Congress of the United States from the State of Oregon are hereby urged to use their influence in behalf of the passage of said bill; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the Senate of the State of Oregon be directed to transmit by mail a copy of this memorial to the President

of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State of Oregon in Congress.

Adopted by the house January 16, 1920.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate January 15, 1920.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Indorsed: Senate joint memorial No. 6. By Senator Ritner.

J. W. COCHRAN, *Chief Clerk.*

Filed January 16, 1920.

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 6 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon at the special session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, January 12-17, 1920, and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 16, 1920, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 20th day of January, A. D. 1920.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 5.

Honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress of the United States assembled:

Whereas the people of the State of Oregon believe in an adequate and efficient enforcement of the immigration laws now on the statute books, and the enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary to bring about the effective exclusion of, and also the deportation from the United States of undesirable aliens, particularly those who are unattached to American ideals and who seek by violent and unlawful means to undermine or overthrow our Government; and Whereas the United States Immigration Service, through the collection of head tax, imposed upon aliens entering the United States, has caused to be collected and turned into the United States Treasury millions of dollars in excess of the cost of maintenance and operation of said service; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has not yet made an adequate appropriation for the said United States Immigration Service to permit of a full and adequate scrutiny of those aliens seeking admission into the United States, and the comprehensive inspection, apprehension, and deportation of those undesirable aliens already within our country unlawfully and here to our country's detriment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon in special session assembled, That we do hereby petition and earnestly pray the honorable Congress of the United States for the passage of such legislation as may be necessary to effectually expel and keep out undesirable and disloyal aliens, and particularly to make the sufficient appropriation of those very necessary funds required to vitalize and make effective the execution of the said immigration laws now in force and to be enacted; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Oregon to the Senate of the United States, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Oregon to the House of Representatives of the United States, and that copies thereof be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Oregon to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Oregon, with the request that they use every effort within their power to bring about an accomplishment of the ends and purposes herein indicated.

Adopted by the house January 13, 1920.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate January 15, 1920.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 5. Introduced by Mr. Lewis and Mr. Kubli.

W. F. DRAGER, *Chief Clerk.*

Filed January 16, 1920.

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 5 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon at the special session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, January 12-17, 1920, and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 16, 1920, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 20th day of January, A. D. 1920.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 8.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, the Senate concurring, respectfully represent this: That—Whereas the Oregon Irrigation Congress did heretofore appoint a committee for the purpose of obtaining Federal aid to be used in investigating the irrigation possibilities of what is known as the Deschutes project in central Oregon; and

Whereas, as the result of the efforts of the committee so appointed, the Federal Government has caused a geological survey to be made; and Whereas the investigation was made under the direction of Prof. Crosby under authority of the Government of the United States of America, who has heretofore filed his report favorable to the development of this project; and

Whereas it is of the utmost importance to the development of the irrigation and farming in central Oregon that the Federal Government take the necessary steps to develop the Deschutes project as speedily as possible, so that approximately 250,000 acres of land may be made productive in Deschutes, Crook, and Jefferson Counties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate concurring), That the Representative Assembly of the State of Oregon favors the passage of any act by the United States Congress which will provide means with which the Deschutes project may be financed and developed by Federal aid; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be directed to transmit by mail a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Oregon in Congress.

Adopted by the house January 17, 1920.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate January 17, 1920.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 8. Introduced by Mr. Burdick.

W. F. DRAGER,
Chief Clerk.

Filed January 22, 1920.

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of House joint memorial No. 8 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon at the special session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon January 12-17, 1920, and filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oregon January 22, 1920, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 20th day of January, A. D. 1920.

[SEAL.] BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 2.

Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America urging the United States Government to enact pending legislation and such additional legislation as will most adequately and speedily promote highway construction, and urging the appropriation by Congress of sufficient funds to enable the Federal Government and the various States to construct an adequate system of forest roads and post roads.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in special session, jointly concurring, respectfully represent that—

Whereas the American Association of Highway Officials in convention assembled at Louisville, Ky., on December 11, 1919, adopted a series of resolutions, copies of which resolutions were transmitted to the House of Representatives and the United States Senate, in which resolutions there were, among other matters urged upon the attention and consideration of the United States Congress, the following facts:

That the States within whose boundaries are included large national forest reserves have expended during the last five years millions of dollars in the improvement of State and country highway systems.

That the majority of these States have issued bonds in large amounts in order to finance modern highway construction.

That there are within the boundaries of these States approximately 150,000,000 acres of national forest reserves.

That State and county highways of national importance traverse these reservations through areas involving the most difficult highway construction of the West.

That the forests in these various States are great national assets, which should be preserved, and the construction of roads and highways traversing the said forests facilitate the control of forest fires, which have in the past caused tremendous losses.

That the appropriations heretofore made by Congress have been inadequate to permit of sufficient road construction within such national forests to keep pace with State and county highway systems and construction or to provide for a standard of construction equaling that of the several States and counties.

That the withdrawal of large areas by the Government has decreased the taxable resources of the States and counties wherein such withdrawals have been made, thereby reducing the bonding capacity of said States and counties.

That it is the duty of the National Government to provide sufficient funds to develop its national resources to the same extent and standards as that of the States and counties similarly situated; and

Whereas the facts and conditions heretofore stated apply with equal force, as emphasized by said American Association of Highway Officials, to Indian and other Federal reservations and to unappropriated lands of the United States; and

Whereas the said American Association of Highway Officials, by said series of resolutions, have urged upon the Congress of the United States the necessity of appropriating at least \$10,000,000 per year for the next 10 years, of which appropriation no less than 75 per cent should be expended in the construction of primary State and county highways within and adjacent to national forests, and have urged upon said Congress the necessity of appropriating at least \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and \$5,000,000 per year thereafter for the next nine years for the purpose of constructing highways through Indian and other Federal reservations or unappropriated lands of the United States; and

Whereas the said American Association of Highway Officials did, by said resolution, urge upon the United States Congress the appropriation of the following sums of money:

\$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.
 \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.
 \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923.
 \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924.

And whereas there is pending before Congress proposed legislation having for its aim the creation and construction of a system of national highways, which legislation has received the indorsement of the American Association of Highway Officials; and

Whereas the said American Association of Highway Officials has in said resolutions urged and recommended that the said system of national highways shall be selected by the various States in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads; and

Whereas your memorialists, the Senate and House of the Representatives of the State of Oregon, unanimously indorse the facts set out in the resolutions adopted by the said American Association of Highway Officials, and we respectfully urge upon the United States Congress the further fact that the State of Oregon occupies a peculiar and special position with reference to national forests and other national and Federal reserves and, therefore, is in a peculiar and special need of adequate highway construction: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (in special session, jointly concurring), That we do hereby most respectfully urge and request that the Congress of the United States of America give special and immediate attention to the passage of pending legislation relative to national highway construction and the creation of a system of national highways and to such other legislation as will be in harmony with the resolutions of the said American Association of Highway Officials, and we further urge that the said Congress of the United States of America appropriate for highway construction the amounts and appropriations herein designated, and such other additional amounts as will be necessary to most effectively promote highway constructions, and we urge that such appropriations be made in such manner and in such amounts as will most effectively and adequately enable the Bureau of Public Roads to continue its present cooperation with the various States in the construction of highways: Be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon is hereby authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this memorial, under the seal of his office, to every Member of the delegation and to the presiding officer of the Senate of the United States and to the presiding officer of the House of Representatives in Congress.

Adopted by the house January 13, 1920.

Adopted by the senate January 15, 1920.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 2.

Filed January 16, 1920.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Introduced by Mr. Dennis,
 W. F. DRAGER,
Chief Clerk.

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 STATE OF OREGON,
 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state for the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 2 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon at the special session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, January 12-17, 1920, and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 16, 1920, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon. In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 20th day of January, A. D. 1920.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask to have printed

in the Record and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate joint resolution 12.

Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

Whereas there is now pending before the Senate of the United States Senate bill 1309, providing for the construction of a national highway system; and

Whereas the provisions of said bill are of great value to the entire United States, and particularly to the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas said bill has the hearty approval of the Federal highway councils of both the States of Washington and Oregon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to favor the passage of said act; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be directed to transmit immediately a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate and to all of the Oregon Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Adopted by the house January 17, 1920.

SEYMOUR JONES,
Speaker of the House.

Adopted by the senate January 16, 1920.

W. T. VINTON,
President of the Senate.

Indorsed: Senate joint resolution No. 12. By Senator Norblad,
 J. W. COCHRAN,
Chief Clerk.

Filed January 17, 1920.

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 STATE OF OREGON,
 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint resolution No. 12 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon at the special session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, January 12-17, 1920, and filed in the office of the secretary of state January 17, 1920, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 20th day of January, A. D. 1920.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

Mr. CURTIS. I present resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas in favor of the enactment of legislation to protect the National Guard. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 8.

Whereas the record made by the National Guard troops in the Great War and the efficiency of the officers and men entitle the National Guard of the United States to the fullest measure of support and the widest opportunity for the development of a military force which the public sentiment of this country demands shall be the backbone of its military strength—that great body of citizen soldiery who answered the call, never flinched in the face of the severest fire, and whose record of achievement stands as a guaranty of the ability of this organization to handle its own affairs and any situation that may confront it; and

Whereas the National Guard of the United States has developed to a high degree of efficiency when organized under the militia clauses of the Constitution of the United States, which reserve to the States the right of appointment of officers and the training of troops; and

Whereas the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate of the United States has reported the Army reorganization bill, S. 3688, which provides that the National Guard shall become a part of the Army of the United States; and

Whereas the adoption of such revolutionary measures will place the appointment of officers of the National Guard in the hands of the President of the United States; and

Whereas under this proposed act the governors of States can not call upon troops for the suppression of any disorders which may arise in the States without first obtaining the consent of the Federal Government; and

Whereas such summary legislation will in effect destroy the traditions of the National Guard and local pride and wipe out an organization which has been the backbone of the military strength of the country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That we commend the action taken by Members of the Senate of the United States representing the State of Kansas who have opposed the passage of any legislation which shall abrogate the prerogatives of the States guaranteed under the militia clauses of the Federal Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States, requesting that they shall take such action in the reorganization of the military forces of the country which shall give to the National Guard the fullest measure of support, the widest opportunity for development, and which shall at all times reserve to the governors of the States the

right of appointment of officers and training of troops guaranteed to them under the militia clauses of the Federal Constitution.
I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house and passed that body January 23, 1920.

W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Speaker of the House.
CLARENCE W. MILLER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Passed the senate January 23, 1920.

CHAS. S. HUFFMAN,
President of the Senate.
EMMET D. GEORGE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved January 27, 1920.

HENRY J. ALLEN, *Governor.*

Mr. CURTIS. I also present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, praying that appropriations be made for the construction of good roads. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 4.

A resolution requesting the Congress of the United States now in session to pass the bill, already introduced, appropriating funds to aid the several States in the construction of roads.

Whereas there is now before the Congress of the United States a bill making appropriations for the further cooperation of the Federal Government with the several States in the construction of roads.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That we most respectfully urge the passage of this bill in order that the States may continue their present road-building program and give assistance to many petitions now on file for which there are no Government funds.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house, and passed that body January 9, 1920.

W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Speaker of the House.
CLARENCE W. MILLER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Passed the senate January 23, 1920.

CHAS. S. HUFFMAN,
President of the Senate.
EMMET D. GEORGE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved January 27, 1920.

HENRY J. ALLEN, *Governor.*

Mr. CURTIS. I also present resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, praying for a revision of the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 5.

Memorializing Congress to revise the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States.

Whereas the strained relations existing between the employers and the employees of the Nation have been found by the agents of Government to be due in large measure to the prevalence amongst our alien residents and citizens of foreign birth to illiteracy, pauperism, wrong ideals of freedom, liberty, and democracy, and prejudice against government, law, and order, engendering an almost complete inability to understand our institutions and government and thus endangering the safety and perpetuity of popular government in State and Nation; and

Whereas we are persuaded that the prevention of increase in this class of population is necessary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact into law as speedily as possible measures which shall look to stopping this stream of evil at its source. We earnestly recommend that such a national statute upon immigration should include:

First. An examination at the port of embarkation in the country of which he is a citizen of every prospective emigrant to the United States. This examination should be made so thorough and minute that the consular representative of the United States conducting the same may become thoroughly acquainted with the moral character of the prospective emigrant in the community in which he lives and his financial ability to care for himself and family, if he have one.

Second. His ideas concerning the supremacy of organized government and law, his political ideals and affiliations in regard to the theories of government and society, particularly concerning those doctrines known as free love, polygamy, communism, radicalism, socialism, bolshevism, and anarchy.

Upon completing such examination and finding the prospective emigrant qualified in all the respects indicated to become a citizen of the United States, the consul shall issue to him a passport which will entitle him to enter the United States at the port to which the vessel upon which he embarks is chartered. The immigration officers at the port of debarkation must refuse landing privilege to any immigrant who does not possess such passport.

We further recommend that the period of probation before being admitted to citizenship shall be extended to five years, and until the applicant has satisfied the court that he has the ability to read, write, and speak the English language and to understand the foundation principles of our Government as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, and all present wholesome restrictions in other respects be retained.

Resolved, That duly authenticated and engrossed copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each House of Congress, and to each Senator and every Representative in Congress from the State of Kansas.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the house and passed that body January 13, 1920.

W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Speaker of the House.
CLARENCE W. MILLER,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Passed the senate January 21, 1920.

CHAS. S. HUFFMAN,
President of the Senate.
EMMET D. GEORGE,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved January 27, 1920.

HENRY J. ALLEN, *Governor.*

Mr. CURTIS presented petitions of the Judson Kilpatrick Post, No. 36, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Newton; of General Russell Post, No. 65, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Pittsburg; of O. M. Mitchell Post, No. 69, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Osborne; and of Preston B. Plumb Post, No. 55, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Emporia, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called Fuller pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Kans., praying for the ratification of the peace treaty with reservations, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Kans., praying for an appropriation to purchase food-stuffs for the relief of stricken Europe, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution of the American Commission on Irish Independence, adopted at a meeting held in Topeka, Kans., favoring the independence of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MOSES. I present resolutions relating to the disposition of northern Epirus, the Twelve Islands of the Aegean, and the western coast of Asia Minor, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas northern Epirus, south of a line drawn from the Bay of Grammala northeastward to the Ostrovista Mountain and thence northward to Lake Ochrida and Prespa, has always been Greek, geographically, historically, ethnologically, and strategically; and Whereas the Docanese, or Twelve Islands of the Aegean, have always been Greek; and

Whereas the western coast of Asia Minor, from the Gulf of Adramyti to the Bay of Makri, which lies to the northwest of the Island of Rhodes, including the entire Province of Aidin, with the exception of the District of Denizli, including also the District of Ballikesser, which is a part of the Vilayet of Broussa, is preponderantly Greek: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that northern Epirus, the Twelve Islands of the Aegean, and the western coast of Asia Minor, where a strong Greek population predominates, should be awarded by the peace conference to Greece and become incorporated in the Kingdom of Greece.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I present a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Commercial Club of Aberdeen, S. Dak., relative to an appropriation to purchase grain to feed the people of central Europe and the Near East. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution.

ABERDEEN, S. DAK.

Be it resolved, That the board of directors of the Aberdeen Commercial Club urgently recommends that Congress, in order to avert famine and to promote the resumption of stable economic and political conditions in the countries of central Europe outside of Germany and in Armenia, authorize the United States Grain Corporation or other suitable agency to purchase and to transport to those countries where famine is imminent and the Governments of which are unable, through lack of necessary resources, to provide for the subsistence of their peoples, food, supplies, and other necessities of life; to sell such supplies on credit to the Governments of said countries and so to regulate their distribution as most effectively to provide for the prompt and sufficient relief of the populations in need; and that Congress appropriate such sum as may be necessary for the purpose.

THE ABERDEEN COMMERCIAL CLUB,
By A. W. CAMPBELL, *President.*

Correct—attest.

[SEAL]
Dated January 20, 1920.

GEO. C. MANTOR, *Secretary.*

Mr. McNARY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring the submission by Congress to the legislatures of the several States of a proposed amendment to the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing that children born in the United States or in

the territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof and whose parents are not citizens and can not under existing laws acquire citizenship by naturalization shall retain the citizenship of the parents and shall not become citizens by reason of birth in the United States or any Territories subject to the jurisdiction thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a national road to be named after the late President Roosevelt, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, praying for the immediate opening of the Klamath Indian Reservation for settlement, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, praying for the location of a life-saving station at Port Orford, Curry County, Oreg., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the restoration for entry of certain lands in Klamath County, Oreg., which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of a national highway system, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, praying that an appropriation be made to enable the Federal Government and the various States to construct an adequate system of forest roads and post roads, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the patrol of our forests by airplanes during the 1920 season, which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to expel and prohibit undesirable and disloyal aliens, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide means by which the Deschutes project may be financed and developed by Federal aid, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions of Judson Kilpatrick Post, No. 36, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Newton; of George I. Ransome Post, No. 303, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Kansas City; of Abilene Post, No. 63, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Abilene; of Lew Gove Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Manhattan; and of Major Elliott Post, No. 437, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Ashland, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called Fuller pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STERLING presented a resolution adopted at a convention of county commissioners of the State of South Dakota, favoring a national highway system, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the New York State Bar Association, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the procedure in Federal courts, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PHELAN. I present a memorial of the City Council, of Oakland, Calif., remonstrating against the proposed importation of Chinese laborers into the United States. I ask that the memorial be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Oakland City Council—Resolution No. 19610 N. S., introduced by Commissioner Morse.

Resolution declaring sense of the council of Oakland as opposing and condemning the importation of Chinese laborers to the United States to compete with American laborers, and urging Congress to prevent such importation.

Whereas a proposition, financed by unknown sources, has been inaugurated for the purpose of importing to the United States a large number of natives of China to work as laborers in this country, thus making them a commodity in the labor market of the United States; and

Whereas this Oakland City Council believes that such a course would be detrimental to the labor conditions in this country by effecting competition between American workers and such Chinese laborers; and

Whereas this council believes that any problem of alleged shortage of farm hands can be solved by the employment of American labor, and without the assistance of Chinese coolies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oakland City Council hereby expresses itself as being opposed to such a plan, and hereby condemns any and all efforts to import oriental laborers or any other encroachment of American ideals: And be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this protest of the council be sent to our Representatives and Senators in Washington.

I certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution passed by the council of the city of Oakland on January 8, 1920.

L. W. CUMMINGS, City Clerk.
By W. W. CHAPPELL, Deputy.

[SEAL.]

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of Upland Post No. 73, American Legion, of Upland, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation defining sedition and providing punishment therefor, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MYERS presented a petition of the Park County Chamber of Commerce, of Livingston, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation to supply seed grain for 1920 planting to farmers in drought-stricken districts, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. ROBINSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 557) for the relief of Oscar C. Guessaz, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 406) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 1533) for the relief of Anna M. Tobin, independent executrix of the estate of Frank R. Tobin, deceased, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 407) thereon.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 151) to permit the payment for certain lands whereon Army supply bases are situated, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 408) thereon.

CUSTER BATTLE FIELD NATIONAL CEMETERY.

Mr. WALSH of Montana, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3485) to provide for building and furnishing a building at Custer Battle Field National Cemetery for use as an office for the custodian and for the convenience and comfort of the public, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

INVENTIONS, PATENTS, AND PATENT RIGHTS.

Mr. NORRIS. From the Committee on Patents I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 3223) authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to accept and administer for the benefit of the public and the encouragement of industry, inventions, patents, and patent rights, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 405) thereon.

I take this occasion to say to the Senate that I shall ask for permission to take up the bill and consider it at a very early date, possibly on Monday. I call the attention of Senators to the bill at this time so they may look into it if they desire to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

ARMY REORGANIZATION.

Mr. MCKELLAR. On behalf of the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs, I beg leave to submit a minority report (No. 400, Part II) on Senate bill 3792, known as the Army reorganization bill.

In submitting the report I merely desire to call attention to the total figures of the cost of our Military Establishment in the event that the Army reorganization bill reported by the majority is passed by the Congress and approved by the President.

According to the best figures we are able to obtain, the cost of the Army per annum as provided in that bill will be \$1,314,143,000. I wish to say that if we pass the bill it will be necessary to increase the taxes upon the people of the United States in order to meet the demands that will be made.

I desire to say that when we pass this bill it will also be necessary to raise the taxes upon the people of the United States in order to meet the demands that will thereby be made. It is incredible to me that the Senate of the United States can for a moment think of passing such a bill at such a time. In presenting the minority report I call the attention of the Senate to the matter, hoping they will read the report before the bill comes up to be voted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. SMOOT. Pursuant to Senate resolution 203, submitted by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] and adopted on October 3, 1919, the various heads of the executive departments have sent at various dates their responses, which were ordered to lie on the table.

In my opinion, these reports should be printed as a Senate document, with a table of contents in the front thereof. To that end I offer the following resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. Will not the Senator wait until we reach the order of resolutions?

Mr. SMOOT. This may be regarded as a report of the Joint Committee on Printing. It is really a report of a committee.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

The resolution (S. Res. 290) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the several communications from the heads of the executive departments, transmitting, pursuant to a Senate resolution of October 3, 1919, detailed statements concerning the character, amount, and estimated cost of work now being carried on in the respective departments in relation to the foreign commerce of the United States, be printed as a Senate document.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 3821) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901," and the acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. KEYES):

A bill (S. 3822) for the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station on the White Mountain National Forest in the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 3823) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Pierce; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 3824) granting an increase of pension to Alma L. Bruce (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 3825) to authorize the construction of the Lincoln and Lee Memorial Bridge over the Potomac River.

Mr. KING. I think the bill should be referred to the Committee on the Library, although it seems to me that it is the wrong committee. I am told that all matters with reference to what may be denominated monuments go to the Committee on the Library.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does it relate to a national memorial?

Mr. KING. It is to take the place of the old Chain Bridge over the Potomac above Georgetown.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that that part of the river is a nonnavigable stream. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 3826) authorizing and requiring the Capital Traction Co. to operate its cars through G Street NW., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 3827) granting an increase of pension to Ezra J. Osborn; to the Committee on Pensions.

WRANGELL (ALASKA) BOND ISSUE.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 10746, being Order of Business 309.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The title of the bill referred to by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 10746) to authorize the incorporated town of Wrangell, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction, enlargement, and equipment of schools, the acquisition and construction of a water-supply system, the construction of a sewer system, the construction of a city dock and floating dock, and to levy and collect a special tax therefor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Territories with an amendment, in section 4, page 2, line 19, before the words "per cent," to strike out "7" and insert "6," so as to read:

That the bonds above specified, when authorized to be issued as herebefore provided, shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 6 per cent per annum, payable annually, and shall be sold for not less than their

par value, with accrued interest, and shall be in denominations not exceeding \$1,000 each, the principal to be due in 20 years from the date thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LAND FOR WALTER REED HOSPITAL.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, the other day I called the attention of the Senate to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 147) to amend the Army appropriation act, approved July 11, 1919, being Order of Business 337 on the calendar. The purpose of the joint resolution is to correct a ruling of the auditor in connection with land the purchase of which Congress authorized in connection with the maintenance of Walter Reed Hospital.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator pardon me?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. We must have an executive session; and if the consideration of the joint resolution to which the Senator refers is going to take any length of time I shall have to object.

Mr. SPENCER. I think it will take no time at all. I think there is no objection to it.

Mr. President, we authorized the expenditure of \$350,000 for the purchase of certain land which is necessary for Walter Reed Hospital. In the same act, however, there was a provision prohibiting the use of the money therein appropriated for the purchase of land. The auditor ruled that the latter general prohibition excluded the definite appropriation which we had made. It is in order to correct that ruling that this joint resolution was favorably reported from the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF AIR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, the Senate has for the last two or three days had under consideration Senate bill 3348, creating a separate department of air. It is evident that there is still a very general misapprehension on the part of Senators as to just what the bill proposes to do. It is true that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs had the bill under consideration from July to November last, and that the report of the Committee on Military Affairs in favor of the bill was by a majority of 9 to 2. At the same time, as I have stated, it is evident that the purpose and scope of the bill are still misunderstood, and particularly so by certain members of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, as to its effect and bearing upon the air services in those departments.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the bill recommended to the Committee on Military Affairs for their further consideration. I desire to say in this connection that if that privilege is granted I shall endeavor to see that the members of the committees named are given the fullest opportunity for investigation and such inquiry as they may see fit to make, and I sincerely hope that they will avail themselves of the opportunity which will be then offered, an opportunity of which they did not, perhaps, take full advantage during the long period that the bill was under consideration last summer and fall.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think the suggestion made by the Senator from Indiana is very wise, and I am sure it is the best plan to be pursued; but I wish to ask the Senator if it would be possible for his committee or some one to segregate from the two large volumes of testimony relative to the subject matter of the bill and other subjects that which bears alone upon aircraft and have that testimony printed separately? I have spent a great deal of time in going through the two volumes, but it is only with the utmost difficulty, unless one has an abundance of time, that it is possible to segregate the testimony bearing upon that question. Many of us desire to familiarize ourselves with this very important question.

Mr. NEW. I think what the Senator from Utah suggests would be possible and of advantage.

Mr. KING. I merely suggest it to the Senator.

Mr. NEW. Hearings before the Military Affairs Committee were held concurrently on three bills, and it is true that as they appear in the printed volumes of the hearings the subjects are, perhaps, somewhat involved. I will endeavor to see that the suggestion of the Senator from Utah is carried out.

Mr. KING. I have spent a good many hours in going through this testimony, and I doubt if many other Senators

would have the patience to do so; but if it should be printed in compact form Senators will familiarize themselves, I think, with this important matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] that the bill referred to by him be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to withdraw the notice given a few days ago of a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Indian appropriation bill was passed.

I make this withdrawal after a conference with and at the instance of Members of the House who are interested in the questions in controversy between the two Houses.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

TREATY WITH PARAGUAY.

The Senate, in executive session, this day ratified the following treaty between the United States and Paraguay, and, on motion of Mr. LODGE, the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom.

The treaty is as follows:

The SENATE:

I transmit herewith, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention between the United States and Paraguay, signed October 20, 1919, for the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 24 January, 1920.

The PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention October 20, 1919, between the United States and Paraguay, for the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT LANSING.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, October 22, 1919.

The United States of America and the Republic of Paraguay, being desirous to foster the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen, have agreed to conclude a convention for that purpose and have to that end appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America; Robert Lansing, Secretary of State of the United States of America; and the President of the Republic of Paraguay, Manuel Gondra, envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary for the Republic of Paraguay, near the Government of the United States of America, who, having communicated to each other their full powers, which were found to be in due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I.

Manufacturers, merchants, and traders domiciled within the jurisdiction of one of the high contracting parties may operate as commercial travelers, either personally or by means of agents or employees, within the jurisdiction of the other high contracting party on obtaining from the latter, upon payment of a single fee, a license which shall be valid throughout its entire territorial jurisdiction.

In case either of the high contracting parties shall be engaged in war it reserves to itself the right to prevent from operating within its jurisdiction, under the provisions of this convention or otherwise, enemy nationals or other aliens whose presence it may consider prejudicial to public order and national safety.

ARTICLE II.

In order to secure the license above mentioned the applicant must obtain from the country of domicile of the manufacturers, merchants, and traders represented a certificate attesting his character as a commercial traveler. This certificate, which shall be issued by the authority to be designated in each country for the purpose, shall be viséed by the consul of the country

in which the applicant proposes to operate, and the authorities of the latter shall, upon the presentation of such certificate, issue to the applicant the national license as provided in Article I.

ARTICLE III.

A commercial traveler may sell his samples without obtaining a special license as an importer.

ARTICLE IV.

Samples without commercial value shall be admitted to entry free of duty.

Samples marked, stamped, or defaced in such manner that they can not be put to other uses shall be considered as objects without commercial value.

ARTICLE V.

Samples having commercial value shall be provisionally admitted upon giving bond for the payment of lawful duties if they shall not have been withdrawn from the country within a period of six months.

Duties shall be paid on such portion of the samples as shall not have been so withdrawn.

ARTICLE VI.

All customs formalities shall be simplified as much as possible with a view to avoid delay in the dispatch of samples.

ARTICLE VII.

Peddlers and other salesmen who vend directly to the consumer, even though they have not an established place of business in the country in which they operate, shall not be considered as commercial travelers, but shall be subject to the license fees levied on business of the kind which they carry on.

ARTICLE VIII.

No license shall be required of:

(a) Persons traveling only to study trade and its needs, even though they initiate commercial relations, provided they do not make sales of merchandise.

(b) Persons operating through local agencies which pay the license fee or other imposts to which their business is subject.

(c) Travelers who are exclusively buyers.

ARTICLE IX.

Any concession affecting any of the provisions of the present treaty that may hereafter be granted by either high contracting party, either by law or by treaty or convention, shall immediately be extended to the other party.

ARTICLE X.

This convention shall be ratified; and the ratifications shall be exchanged in Washington within two years, or sooner, if possible.

The present convention shall remain in force until the end of six months after either of the high contracting parties shall have given notice to the other of its intention to terminate the same, each of them reserving to itself the right of giving such notice to the other at any time. And it is hereby agreed between the parties that, on the expiration of six months after such notice shall have been received by either of them from the other party as above mentioned this convention shall altogether cease and terminate.

In testimony whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed these articles and have thereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate, in English and Spanish, at Washington, this 20th day of October, 1919.

ROBERT LANSING. [SEAL.]
M. GONDRA. [SEAL.]

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 2, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 31, 1920.

DIRECTOR OF WAR FINANCE CORPORATION.

Franklin W. M. Cutcheon, of New York, N. Y., to be a director of the War Finance Corporation, to fill out the unexpired term of William P. G. Harding, resigned.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be colonel.

Lieut. Col. Robert J. Fleming, Cavalry, with rank from January 23, 1920.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. George B. Pritchard, jr., Cavalry, with rank from January 24, 1920.

Maj. Alvord Van P. Anderson, Cavalry, with rank from January 24, 1920.

To be major.

Capt. Frank P. Amos, Cavalry, with rank from January 24, 1920.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 31, 1920.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

David F. Houston, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

Edwin T. Meredith, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

DIRECTOR OF WAR FINANCE CORPORATION.

George R. Cooksey, to be a director of the War Finance Corporation.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

C. J. Lyon, of Greenville, to be United States marshal, western district of South Carolina.

POSTMASTERS.

NEW MEXICO.

Eduardo A. Trujillo, Taos.

NEW YORK.

Norman Cooper, Athens.
William D. Delaney, Clayton.
Charles V. Ford, Clyde.
Stanley W. Parsons, Copenhagen.
Gertrude R. Moran, East Bloomfield.
William L. Fuller, Ellenville.
Clara S. Mallery, Hillsdale.
George M. Durey, Johnstown.
Wilmer D. Sharpe, Loomis.
Willis P. Beal, Macedon.
Thomas Clougher, Piermont.
James E. McWilliams, Prattsville.
Charles H. Corwin, South Fallsburg.
Carl Fuller, Williamston.
Keeler M. Cole, Windham.

TEXAS.

Ella D. Harris, Angleton.
Robert B. Tuck, Bedias.
Walter C. Allison, Breckenridge.
James D. Cooper, Brookshire.
Clarence W. House, Buffalo.
Annie S. Morgan, Caddo Mills.
John W. A. Jackson, Canadian.
Florence F. Kellogg, Carrizo Springs.
Ray D. Tiller, Carthage.
John J. Crockett, Chapel Hill.
Alexander P. Hanna, Crandall.
Leo S. Spencer, Crowell.
William H. Pitman, Cushing.
Minnie Owens, Dickinson.
Clarence E. Kelly, Eagle Pass.
Lizzie E. Holloway, Ferris.
Harvey C. Dorton, Freeport.
Welcome N. Fields, Ganado.
Cass B. Rowland, Hamlin.
Leslie L. Luque, Hebronville.
Nannie Yeager, Iola.
Sylvan S. McCrary, Joaquin.
William J. Beck, Kaufman.
James F. Faulkner, McLean.
William F. Lehmann, Needville.
John H. Jackson, Nevada.
Theodor Reichert, Nordheim.
Sallie C. Hankinson, Pleasanton.
James F. Connell, Ranger.
Thomas B. Higgins, Reagan.
Joshua J. Carter, Richland Springs.
Frank P. Bell, Richmond.
Almus L. McDonald, Rising Star.
Robert L. Mobley, Santa Anna.
Hilmar F. Theis, Seguin.
James L. Davis, Tenaha.
Herbert W. Scott, Throckmorton.
Lula Ezell, Timpson.
Garland K. Breeding, Van Horn.
Lawson B. Fulgham, Voth.
Charles B. McCollum, Waco.
John T. Hilburn, Wheeler.
Charles F. Hoff, Yorktown.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 31, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Great Father Soul, a potent factor in shaping the destiny of men and of nations, give us the grace to submit ourselves to the heavenly influence, that our thoughts may be in consonance with Thy thoughts and our ways in consonance with Thy ways; and thus meet the great problems which confront us as individuals and as a people, and solve them to the well-being of our people and of all concerned; and so hasten the coming of Thy kingdom, that happiness and prosperity may smile upon all the world, and glory, and honor, and praise be Thine. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FORT BERTHOLD INDIANS.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4382) to confer on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to determine the respective rights of and differences between the Fort Berthold Indians and the United States, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota calls up the bill H. R. 4382, with a Senate amendment thereto, and moves to concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk reported the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, what is this bill about?

Mr. SINCLAIR. It is a bill to confer on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to decide the rights and obligations that exist between this Government and the Fort Berthold Indians. It passed the House in December and passed the Senate, but through an inadvertence a typographical error occurred, which the Senate has corrected by amendment. The word "unit" was printed instead of the word "suits."

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

ZONING COMMISSION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6863) to regulate the height, area, and the use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to all of the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6863, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman whether he has talked with the ranking Democrat on the committee in respect to this?

Mr. MAPES. I have.

Mr. GARNER. And this meets with his approval?

Mr. MAPES. It does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What has ever been done about the apartment house up here near Mrs. Henderson's?

Mr. MAPES. The resolution reported by the committee is on the calendar.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does it restrict the height of buildings, that one can see from the top of Meridian Hill the glories of the city of Washington?

Mr. MAPES. The resolution as proposed provides for a building 2 feet lower than the plans of the building called for.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does that accomplish the purpose that Mrs. Henderson had in mind?

Mr. MAPES. Mrs. Henderson is in favor of the resolution.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If she is in favor of it, I am too.

Mr. MAPES. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that there have been some obstacles in the way of the passage of the resolution, and that there is no present intention upon the part of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia to call it up.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The obstacle is the fellow who owns the apartment building that is under construction, is it not?

Mr. MAPES. The plans and arrangements had all been completed and the building started, the proposition financed according to the existing law, and it did not seem practicable or fair to change the regulation at so late a date in the proceedings. In fact, the builders to put up the building had given an indemnity bond of several hundred thousand dollars to erect the building according to certain plans and specifications, which called for a building 2 feet higher than the resolution fixes as proper.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not recall, but have we not now a commission or something that undertakes to pass upon the height of buildings in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MAPES. No; we have a Fine Arts Commission, but it does not have authority to pass upon the height of buildings.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman mean to say that one can erect a building here of any height without any permit or approval?

Mr. MAPES. He must have a permit, but there is no authority to limit the height of buildings.

Mr. WINGO. What authority have they—just the authority to grant the permits?

Mr. MAPES. There are certain building restrictions and regulations with which they have to comply.

Mr. WINGO. By whom are the restrictions made? Are they made by the commissioners or by Congress or by a commission?

Mr. MAPES. By the commissioners of the District, under authority, of course, granted by Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there is a building code which requires the appointment of a building commissioner and building inspectors, who have the authority to specify the kind of construction that shall be employed in the erection of buildings.

Mr. WINGO. Do they not fix the height?

Mr. MADDEN. They have not the power to fix the height.

Mr. WINGO. Somebody in the past has refused to approve plans for buildings that were too high. How is it they permit some persons to put them up and others not? I understand the committee has reported out a bill in this particular Meridian Hill matter. Is it going to be the policy of Congress to undertake to fix the height of each particular building because some one objects that it might obstruct the view, or are we going to have a commission which will undertake to regulate that?

Mr. MAPES. Under the authority of this bill, which has already passed both Houses and which I am asking to have sent to conference, the District Commissioners are given the power to make regulations fixing the height of buildings.

Mr. WINGO. That is the bill the gentleman is now undertaking to send to conference?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. That will undertake to cover all of this, so that we will not be worried by complaints that come up from time to time?

Mr. MAPES. Yes. If this bill had been a law, there would be no occasion to come to Congress in respect to the building up near Meridian Hill.

Mr. MADDEN. It is within the power of the building commissioner, who is under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners of the District, to say whether a building shall be a certain height or not, if its construction does not comply with what he believes is safe construction.

Mr. WINGO. Somebody in the District heretofore has undertaken to determine the height and character of the material and even the capacity of buildings.

Mr. MADDEN. They have got to do that.

Mr. WINGO. Of certain types of buildings, and yet I notice every now and then that somebody complains because a certain building is too high, or that they permit too many automobiles to go into the garage, or something of that kind. Even the lawyers in the District seem to be confused about where the jurisdiction lies.

Mr. MAPES. There is a law which limits the height of buildings to twice the width of the street on which they are constructed.

Mr. WINGO. But that law has never been enforced that I have been able to find.

Mr. MAPES. I do not know as to that.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman will find on nearly every important street buildings that violate that provision.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, the building commission has power to prescribe the kind of material that shall go into the buildings, whether it be fireproof, incombustible, and the manner in which they shall erect the buildings, and they have the right to

say how much air space, and so forth, shall be afforded, and how much light space shall be afforded, and so forth.

Mr. WINGO. Is he the gentleman who is permitting these magnificent alleged fireproof apartment houses to be constructed with partitions made of common plaster board, that if an ordinary boy were to fall against it it would break? Is he the gentleman permitting that?

Mr. MADDEN. If they violate the law they are liable.

Mr. WINGO. Who is?

Mr. MADDEN. The commissioner is liable for any injury that may happen by reason of faulty construction.

Mr. WINGO. The point I am getting at is it is notorious that certain buildings are being built and sold to investors as strictly fireproof buildings and in most of them the partitions are nothing but thin plaster board that any ordinary man could take his fist and ram through it. It is true that important structures are being palmed off on the public as fireproof.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. What is before the House?

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MAPES. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not take the gentleman off his feet by a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DYER. I make the point of order that the House is not in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan to disagree to the Senate amendments and send the bill to conference?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—if the gentleman from Massachusetts wants to take the responsibility of forcing the question now—I am not so much concerned about the height of these buildings or whether some investor gets cheated in his transaction or not, as I imagine most of them can take care of most of their own property and do not need the guardianship of Congress, but I am concerned in not having this great row we had once before in which a most estimable lady's name, that of Mrs. Henderson, was connected in reference to the changing of Sixteenth Street to the Avenue of the Presidents. I hope there is nothing in this bill that leads in that direction.

Mr. MAPES. There is nothing of the sort in this bill.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WINGO. In reference to the remark of the gentleman as to interest in investors, I am not interested in them, but I have a common interest in the safety and the health of the people of the District, which are being jeopardized by the mere shells being put up in the District of Columbia under the guise of fireproof structures.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. LITTLE. I suggest—

Mr. WINGO. I object, unless we can get some information.

Mr. LITTLE (continuing). That the gentleman notify the United States attorney if there is any crime, and he has been modifying ever since I told him I was going to ask that.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman may notify him. I do not consider it a part of my duties. I will be glad to give him any facts I get on the subject. I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair announces the following conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAPES, Mr. FOCHT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman from Arkansas object?

Mr. WINGO. I said I would object unless I could get information; but I will withdraw the objection, as I understand the gentlemen over there want to attend to some business. If they wish to do that, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, and the announcement of the conferees will stand.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12046.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the urgent deficiency bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. What paragraph is that?

Mr. GOOD. The last paragraph on page 13, which was the last one read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 12 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] to proceed for 10 minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my provincialistic friend from Iowa [Mr. Good] has always entertained such an opposition to the building of the sanatorium at Dawson Springs, Ky., that if there were memorial exercises to be held or a funeral oration to be delivered by the gentleman he would certainly bring in Dawson Springs.

He rushed out to Chicago a few days ago to make a speech before some organization there. He again reasserted his opposition to this proposition. I have always heard that a barking dog never bites. I am also convinced of the proposition that when a man takes both sides of the same proposition at one time or another those who are following or have any confidence in his contention concerning the matter lose faith in him. And yet he comes as a great friend now of the discharged, disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines of this country and criticizes the Secretary of the Treasury and the Bureau of Public Health for not completing, or signing the contract which will complete, the Speedway Hospital in Chicago. If the Speedway Hospital project was meritorious in 1919, when this matter was up, it is meritorious now. If there is a "nigger in the woodpile" now in the matter of the Speedway Hospital in Chicago, there was in 1919.

There was no more bitter speech on the floor of this House when this legislation was being considered than the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] made in condemnation of the Speedway Hospital in Chicago. He said yesterday he followed the Secretary of the Treasury, but that he found if he followed him much further his fingers would get burned. If consistency is the criterion, he is already singed all over now.

Why, gentlemen, he pictures now the deplorable condition of these discharged, disabled soldiers in these wooden hospitals in Chicago. When this legislation was pending the Bureau of Public Health and the Secretary of the Treasury sent communication after communication to the Speaker of this House telling of the deplorable conditions not only at Chicago but all over this country; and yet the gentleman from Iowa has done more to retard the enactment of this legislation and the building of these hospitals and providing and caring for these unfortunate boys than any other man on the American Continent.

I shall refer to Dawson Springs only briefly. I have not time. If you gentlemen will do me the kindness to read the speech I put in the RECORD Wednesday, you will see that it shows whether the contract price for road work there is reasonable or not. He says that Mr. Graff wanted at that time to let the contract to a subcontractor. How would you do that without getting a contractor first to let the contract to? And Mr. Perry says it meant that the Government was to build it, and he said that if this was done the Government would have to have \$100,000 worth of machinery and equipment down there to grade two miles and a half of road. And when the proposition came at the instance of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] to repeal this legislation last spring and summer, if he had had his way about it all of this legislation would have been repealed and the boys all over the country would have had no hope of hospital facilities. And then, when the proposition to repeal it came in the urgent deficiency bill, in the last analysis here, notwithstanding his opposition then to the Speedway Hospital, notwithstanding the accusations he made then, somebody at the last moment here, as you gentlemen will remember, made the gentleman change his mind that night and—*notwithstanding the Speedway Hospital was then a graft, according to his former statements—he let it*

go over, and the excuse was that he wanted to get the urgent deficiency appropriation bill enacted. Or, in other words, according to his former position, he would squander \$9,000,000 of the people's money in hospital facilities just for the purpose of getting the urgent deficiency appropriation bill enacted into law. And when the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. NICHOLLS] asked him and said, in substance, "I voted with you all the time against the Speedway; why have you changed?" he answered, and his answer is shown in his speech in the RECORD of July 28, 1919, as follows:

Humiliated as I have been because of the failure of the Rules Committee to report a rule, and actuated only by a desire to pass appropriation bills within the limit of time, I have been forced to take this position.

Why, the attitude of the Secretary of the Treasury has never been changed on the Speedway proposition, but the position of the gentleman from Iowa has been changed in some way, by some means; and because he has changed, he came in a spirit of criticism on the floor here yesterday and not only criticized the Secretary of the Treasury but the Bureau of Public Health in their activities, and says that a part of this little road work at Dawson Springs is a graft. Gentlemen, in view of the reputation of Carter Glass, the Secretary of the Treasury, and his eminent and faithful service as a Member on the floor of this House, I think it will stand about as well as that of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] when it comes to graft or when it comes to honor and integrity on any proposition. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I do not believe there is a man of higher integrity that walks the soil of the United States than Secretary Glass; and because he has not changed his mind on the Speedway proposition, and because of the further fact that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] has, the latter comes in and criticizes the Secretary of the Treasury.

And yet the gentleman from Iowa comes now to ingratiate himself into the good graces of these disabled soldiers. He is very apprehensive about them now. He wants them all taken care of at this late date. But if it had not been for him, more than any other man, these hospitals, and especially the one at Dawson Springs, would have been constructed and the soldiers would have been receiving the benefit of them to-day. He may think he is getting by with it, but it will meet with the condemnation of these poor, helpless boys, whom we promised when we went into the war, when we adopted the Bureau of War Risk Insurance act, "You bare your breast to the bayonets of the enemy, and when this great fight is over, if you come home maimed and wounded we will not only pay allowances and an indemnity but we will provide for you hospital facilities." That is what this Congress is trying to do, but the monkey wrench was thrown into the machinery by the gentleman from Iowa on this proposition, and, in my judgment, he will receive not only the wrath of every boy that is in these wooden hospitals and exposed to the hazards of fire and cold but he will be held responsible by every friend of these soldiers on the American Continent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to answer the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE] in kind. I am reminded of lines of Shakespeare in one of his immortal plays:

The robb'd that smiles, steals something from the thief.

I answer the gentleman's remarks with a smile.

The gentleman in his remarks the other day, as found at page 2128 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, refers to a Democrat who was appointed by the Bureau of Public Health of the Treasury Department to go to Dawson Springs and superintend the work there, and this is what the gentleman says of him:

The Bureau of Public Health sent a man named Graff to Dawson Springs, and unfortunately his name is spelled G-r-a-f-f, without the "t."

The gentleman realizes that there is a species of graft going on with regard to the contract at Dawson Springs. There is something going on with regard to that contract that smells to high heaven, where a contractor for 2 miles of grading is receiving \$62,000 more for the grading than the Treasury Department estimated it would cost to do the grading. And now the gentleman has tried to malign the character of one man that they sent down there to do the work simply because he dared to tell of the rottenness of the department. As to whether he is honest and reliable, I call the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. I shall ask leave to put into the RECORD the letter of Rupert Blue, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. He appointed this man, commending Mr. Graff for his splendid service.

That simply answers the charge of the gentleman. Mr. Graff was all right and would have been all right if he had been willing to do the will of the men from Dawsonsprings who are attaching themselves to the Treasury Department, and especially to the Public Health Service, and are able, apparently, to get just what they want.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of indorsement of Mr. Graff, the gentleman who has been maligned by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE], may appear in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the letter referred to be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the letter referred to:

DECEMBER 29, 1919.

To whom it may concern:

The bearer of this letter, Mr. B. H. Graff, has been employed for a trifle over a year as field engineer of the United States Public Health Service. During this time he has made inspections of many properties in different parts of the United States and reported on them as to their adaptability for hospital uses, the cost of necessary alterations, and the value of the property. These reports formed the basis of the bureau's recommendations in many cases as to the acquisition of the properties and also the basis of negotiations for the purchase or lease of those which were acquired by the Government for this service. These reports were painstaking and thorough, and were found to be particularly dependable as to valuation.

Mr. Graff also negotiated a lease or purchase of several of these properties. During the latter part of his services in the bureau he was in charge of the preliminary survey for construction work and the layout of roads in connection with the large tuberculosis sanatorium which the service is constructing at Dawsonsprings, Ky.

Mr. Graff has shown most praiseworthy devotion to duty and regard for the interests of the service and the Government. His services have been of much assistance in the development of the large hospital program now being worked out by the service.

Respectfully,

(Signed)

RUPERT BLUZ,
Surgeon General.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay, out of the unexpended balance of the sum of \$1,000,000 appropriated by the joint resolution of October 1, 1918, to aid in combating "Spanish" influenza and other communicable diseases, the bills of the proprietors of certain newspapers published in Chicago, Ill., for the publication of a notice giving warning against influenza on October 3, 1918, as follows: The Chicago Tribune, \$600; the Evening Post, \$366; the Daily Journal, \$366; the Herald-Examiner, \$448; the Evening American, \$504; the Daily News, \$610; in all, \$2,894.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. About October 1, 1918, the Public Health Service prepared a notice in the shape of a warning to the American people concerning Spanish influenza. This notice was published almost universally by the daily press all over the country. But I notice from this paragraph of the deficiency bill that certain newspapers in the city of Chicago make a charge against the Government for giving their patrons the benefit of this warning, the same warning which the patrons of every other newspaper in the United States had as a matter of news beneficial to them.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment. For instance, the Chicago Tribune, for giving its patrons the benefit of the warning, attempts to charge the United States Government \$600. The Evening Post, for giving its patrons the benefit of that warning which would accrue to their help and assistance, attempts to charge the Government \$366. The Daily Journal attempts to charge the United States Government \$366. The Herald-Examiner attempts to charge the Government \$448. The Evening American attempts to charge \$504, and the Daily News \$610.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. As I understand, these announcements were placed in the papers as advertisements in a large special place, as advertisements, under the belief at that time that they would be noticed better and quicker by every one than would be the reading material that they have inserted frequently, warning the people against the prevailing influenza.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman from Illinois believe that the space in the Chicago papers devoted to items of news that would accrue to the benefit of their patrons is to be charged for any more than the like space in the New York papers or the space in the St. Louis papers or the space in the San Francisco papers? Is not the space of one newspaper worth just as much to itself and its patrons as the space of every other newspaper?

Mr. SABATH. There is no doubt about that, but this was placed there as an advertisement.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. It had to be placed in a certain way in Chicago, but in no other city of the United States. I would like to ask the chairman a question about it. If the chairman is willing to pay these Chicago newspapers these various extravagant sums for something that was to the benefit of their patrons what excuse is he going to offer for not paying like sums to every other paper in the land for the same service? Their space was used. Their patrons got the benefit of this warning and influenza was combated by reason of this warning. If we pay these Chicago papers, why should we not pay them all?

Mr. GOOD. The situation in regard to these newspaper advertisements is this: There was about \$10,000 or \$12,000 of the million dollars appropriated to combat influenza used for newspaper advertisements. In all cases excepting these the Secretary of the Treasury approved the bills or the contracts for inserting these advertisements. They were display advertisements of a page or half page—I have forgotten the exact space. But in these cases the Secretary did not approve of the plan and the expenditure until after the advertisements were inserted. Therefore under the ruling they had no authority to pay for them. These advertisements were not paid for, and the others were paid for. That is the reason why this item is carried here as legislation in this bill. There is no question about its being subject to a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the chairman believe that this kind of a warning to the American people was more in the nature of a news item which the readers of every paper had the right to expect from their newspaper rather than have the Government pay for it as an advertisement?

Mr. GOOD. I think practically the whole expenditure was a waste of money.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; a waste of money. That is what it is, and we ought to stop it. I will make the point of order against it—

Mr. GOOD. Wait one moment—

Mr. BLANTON. On the ground that it is not authorized in the law, is new legislation, and that it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order. It is so clearly a waste of public money that I do not think we should take up time with it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas withhold his reservation of the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I withhold it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does not the gentleman believe that his criticism should be directed even more harshly against the department for having paid certain of these bills than against the newspapers that are trying now to get what the other newspapers have already received?

Mr. BLANTON. I took it for granted that my distinguished friend could understand the criticism, apparently veiled to him, which I was making, that these departments ought to be stopped from wasting the public money in any such manner, and that when the newspapers of the country have news items for their patrons they ought not to charge the Government for it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I simply wanted to make it clear that other newspapers received payment for making these publications.

Mr. LITTLE. Did I understand the gentleman from Texas to say "veiled criticism"? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. It was not veiled to anybody except to my friend over there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If that was a veiled criticism, what would a real criticism be?

Mr. BLANTON. It might have been a little of both.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I want to say to the gentleman that while I was in Chicago a few days ago I heard a great deal of discussion in regard to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. There seemed to be a good deal of sentiment that the two most prominently mentioned Democrats of the Nation were the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Bryan, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I do not want the gentleman to couple my name with that of Mr. Bryan. [Laughter.] I do not want to be coupled with anything that is not very much alive otherwise, as well as politically.

Mr. GOOD. I am simply telling the gentleman what the Democracy of the Middle West are talking about in this regard, and I hope the gentleman will not destroy his reputation in the country and in the Middle West by criticizing too strongly

the inefficiency of the present administration in the executive departments, because I realize that the gentleman has a great future.

Mr. BLANTON. In answer to the gentleman I will say that I notice a discussion of myself in to-day's Washington Times. The person in charge of that newspaper, who the Attorney General of the United States and the United States Senate a short time ago proved conclusively was a common, subsidized pimp of German brewers during the war, tries to make out that I have been wasting the time of this House because from time to time I have forced a quorum to attend to business. I have to bear criticism from such a source as that! If the fellow who is running that paper only knew it, my people in my country believe honestly and sincerely that if I could adjourn this Congress for half of the days of the year, so that it would be in session only half of the time, I would be doing a service to the American people, because the longer we sit here the more money we waste and expend and appropriate, and the biggest fool laws that an intelligent person ever dreamed of we pass and permit to go on the statute books, and my people know I am rendering a service every time I force a quorum, even though sometimes I thereby force this House to adjourn. So much for what is reported through the country. No sheet like the Washington Times can hurt me here or elsewhere. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa contend that this is not subject to the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. The item is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Aqueduct Bridge: For continuing the construction of the bridge authorized in section 1 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the removal of what is now known as the Aqueduct Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for the building of a bridge in place thereof," approved May 18, 1916, \$150,000, one-half to be payable out of the Treasury of the United States and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if this is the old bridge over here in Georgetown upon which this Government has wasted so many thousands of dollars during the last 20 years?

Mr. GOOD. This is to build the new bridge authorized to connect Georgetown and Virginia.

Mr. BLANTON. In what way is this a deficiency?

Mr. GOOD. It is to replace the present bridge. It is a deficiency in this sense: We have already appropriated the full amount of the authorized cost, \$1,000,000; but the bridge is under construction and will cost approximately, as I recall it, \$2,000,000, and only \$1,000,000 is authorized. It was authorized before the war. They are working on the bridge, and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have already reported out a bill to increase the limit of cost, as I recall it, to \$2,100,000. Now, a bill of that kind will have to pass. This appropriation is made in anticipation of that bill passing, in order to give the funds that will be immediately necessary so as to continue the work.

Mr. BLANTON. Was there not a contract let for the construction of that new bridge for a specified sum?

Mr. GOOD. No. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] for information as to that. He is a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. DENISON. I will state that the work was not let on contract. The department asked for contracts, but all of the bids that were offered were so high that the Government rejected them and undertook the building of the bridge itself through the engineers of the War Department.

Mr. BLANTON. Then this is not for an additional amount to pay to some contractor over and above his contract price?

Mr. DENISON. Not at all.

Mr. BLANTON. The Government is building the bridge itself?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; the Government is building the bridge itself, and our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have already reported a bill to the House authorizing an additional appropriation to complete this work. I hope the gentleman will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I reserve the point of order. I want to ask a question in reference to this. There was quite a contest in the House concerning the authorization for this bridge. There have been a good many propositions at different times here for different bridges across the Potomac River. There was

quite a controversy in the House over the amount which the bridge might cost. Now the War Department goes ahead and makes plans that it may be never could have been carried out for the original sum authorized. So the increase is not on account of the war. I suppose we are in a position where we have authorized the construction of a bridge, turned the construction over to the War Department, expended in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000, found that we have not yet commenced the work, and we are held by the throat and compelled to appropriate another \$1,000,000.

I really am concerned as to the effect of this item in the bill on the previous authorization. I do not know that I can get any information. I do not know that anybody would be authorized to give the information. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have reported a bill, I believe, increasing the authorization. The total amount heretofore authorized has been appropriated. Here comes in an item to appropriate an additional \$150,000 not now authorized by law, and the question with me is whether the moment we appropriate the additional \$150,000 it does not entirely remove the limitation heretofore provided. If we have appropriated money for a bridge with no limit on the authorization, that is a continuing work or project in process of construction, and there is no limit to the amount of money which may be appropriated therefor. Now, if by this item we exceed the appropriation already authorized and provide for \$150,000 additional, does not that constitute a declaration by Congress that this is to carry out a project already under construction, and will it not authorize appropriations hereafter to any extent, regardless of whether we pass the bill reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or not?

I notice, by the way, that this is called the Aqueduct Bridge. It ought to be called the Georgetown Bridge, but I believe it has a name. Does anybody know the name of it?

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is called the Key Bridge.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am glad there is one gentleman in the House, and he from Virginia, who knows the name conferred on the bridge, by whom I do not know, but certainly without any sense. I knew it was called the Key Bridge, but nobody knows why except the gentleman from Virginia and myself.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman can always get the information on this side.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I had the information, but I wanted to demonstrate that my colleague knew nothing about it.

Mr. SABATH. Your colleague got the information on this side.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to a serious situation that is going to occur in the office of The Adjutant General if this bill passes and becomes a law as it is now written. The facts I should say, in justice to myself, have come to my knowledge since the bill was considered in the Committee on Appropriations. I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, if he will not consent either to introduce an amendment taking care of the situation, or if he will accept an amendment which I would be glad to offer to correct the situation?

The situation is just this: There was an appropriation of \$3,500,000 that was made for the purpose of taking care and custody of the draft records, and for the employment of clerical assistance, for the purpose of furnishing to adjutants general of States statements of the services of soldiers who served in the war with Germany.

You will notice that it was for the specific purpose of furnishing information to adjutants general of the various States.

Now, there is a considerable sum—\$700,000 or \$800,000—that will not be expended or needed for that particular purpose. The Adjutant General and Secretary of War asked the committee not to make a new appropriation but to authorize the expenditure of a certain amount of that sum already appropriated for the purpose of providing clerks to furnish information as to the records of soldiers to the bureaus and those who are lawfully entitled to call for it. If that is not done, it will be necessary for them to discharge 1,290 clerks employed on that work or to transfer them to other work in his office. If that is not done, The Adjutant General states plainly and emphatically that he will not be able to furnish the information to the War Risk Bureau and to the Auditor of the War Department or to the Federal Board for Vocational Training or to the director of finance which is needed in the settlement of claims made by soldiers and in the disposition of claims for medical treatment, allotment, and allowances, and so forth.

I take it that there is not a Member of this House who desires to see that occur, and yet The Adjutant General says that unless he has that authority he will not be able to furnish that information. What will be the result? The soldier will make application to the War Risk Bureau asking for medical treatment, asking for compensation; the Director of the War Risk Bureau can not settle that until he gets the official record of the soldier from The Adjutant General. Likewise, application will be made to the Federal Board for Vocational Training, and the board which will have finally to pass on that application must have official information from The Adjutant General as to the record of that soldier.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. How have they been doing that in the past?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They have had a fund down there and have been able to furnish the information, but The Adjutant General says that the fund is exhausted and unless he gets the additional authorization the clerks will have to be discharged. In addition, the Director of Finance passes on the claims of soldiers for back pay and equipment and other claims, and the Director of Finance must have the official record of the soldier furnished by The Adjutant General. The same is true of the Auditor of the War Department in the settlement of these claims.

Now, the proposition comes to this House, as the Secretary of War and The Adjutant General state, that unless he is given the authority he will not have the force with which to furnish the information. The result will be that the soldiers who need medical treatment, these soldiers who are entitled to have compensation, these soldiers who are entitled to equipment, will be delayed possibly for months, and until the next fiscal year, before they can get their claims acted upon. Every Member of the House will be besieged with letters inquiring why the claims are not allowed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman says that it will be necessary for The Adjutant General to dispense with the services of 1,200 clerks. How many clerks has he?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not recall; I could refer to the hearings.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It takes some little while now to get the information.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; it necessarily does take some time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not suppose that I get every letter from my district, but I will say that I have been wondering why the great delays in these matters have occurred.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I get a great many requests in relation to various claims of soldiers pending before the War Risk Bureau.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman does not get over an average of five a day.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I get many more than that some days, and when I write a letter to The Adjutant General I get a very prompt response. A very few days brings me a response with respect to the soldier or anything else about which I ask. This Congress made an appropriation of \$4,000,000 by way of lump sum to the Secretary of War and he allotted that sum among the various bureaus of his department, and the largest allotment was made to The Adjutant General. These 1,200 clerks have been employed out of that allotment, as I understand it, but that allotment has been practically exhausted, and that is what The Adjutant General means when he says that unless this authorization is given him those clerks now employed under this allotment will have to go out, and he will have no clerks whatever to put upon this work, to furnish this information which is necessary in order to have a speedy settlement of the soldiers' claims. I want to read what The Adjutant General says with reference to the number of clerks he has:

I now have employed on the records of the soldiers of the World War only 60 per cent more clerks than were employed on the records of the Civil War 30 years after its close. * * * In proportion to the number of men demobilized I have less than one-third the number of clerks that were employed on the records of the Army demobilized after the Spanish-American War. I might add that I am now furnishing in the case of soldiers of the World War information of a kind that was not available until 30 years after the Civil War and for many years after the Spanish-American War. This became possible as the result of changes in the method of keeping the records of The Adjutant General's office, effected during the progress of the war. My request for funds to continue the employment of the present number of clerks would, therefore, not seem to be unreasonable.

I submit these soldiers are entitled to have their claims settled promptly, especially those who are disabled. When the Secretary of War and The Adjutant General come before the committee and say that unless we authorize him to use a part of

this appropriation, not to make a new appropriation, but to use a part of the appropriation already made for the employment of these clerks, I think Congress ought to readily accede to it, because if you do not act, then you will be responsible and not the War Department when these soldiers have their claims held up for months. I hope that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goop] will consent to introduce an amendment which will take care of the situation, or if he will not do it, I would be very glad to do it myself, but I hesitate to do so without his full consent as chairman of this committee.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, under all of the circumstances, I do not see how I can possibly introduce an amendment along the line suggested by the Secretary of War. I think there is nothing perhaps that will come before the Congress at this session that is going to determine whether or not we are to have real, efficient management in the executive departments and the discharge of useless clerks any more than this item that the gentleman refers to will disclose. It is here discovered that the Secretary of War threatens, in a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that he will not answer and can not answer letters with regard to discharged soldiers unless we give this appropriation; and yet, out of the lump-sum appropriation of \$4,000,000, he has created in his office a publicity bureau—for what nobody knows—with a man at the head of it drawing \$3,900 a year. That publicity man is there now with a force under him. The War Department had during normal times, in rough figures, approximately \$2,000,000 for its clerical force in Washington, and that amount is carried now in the bill for this year. In addition to that the legislative bill carried \$3,500,000 as a lump sum for securing the draft records for the adjutants general of the several States. In addition to that there is another lump-sum appropriation of \$4,000,000 for clerks in the War Department—\$9,500,000 for clerks in the War Department for the year. Let us see how that was allotted by the Secretary of War. That appropriation of \$4,000,000 was given because Congress wanted The Adjutant General to be able to get the records of the soldiers of this war promptly, and not hold those records open for 30 years. The letter of The Adjutant General is rather misleading, not intentionally. The Adjutant General would have you believe by that letter that for 30 years after the Civil War there was a force employed, whereas, as a matter of fact, a force was not placed in the War Department to compile the records until about 30 years after the close of the Civil War.

Let us see what the Secretary of War did with the \$4,000,000 that we gave him for the force to furnish the information that the boys who have been discharged want and should have. The Secretary of War took for his own office \$277,000, and yet he has his statutory peace-time organization in addition. He gave to the Surgeon General of the United States \$335,000. He gave to the Director of Purchase, Storage and Traffic \$418,000. He gave to the Chief of Ordnance \$680,000. What are these clerks doing? They are down there now doing the work for officers who will not resign, who are here in Washington, as a rule drawing more salary than they could draw at home—not all, by any means, but in the main—preparing work in the Ordnance Department, sending up to Congress this plan and that scheme. There are pending before the Committee on Appropriations estimates for appropriations this year of \$117,000,000 for ammunition and for guns in the fortification estimates, when every sensible man in Congress knows that we are going to pay no attention to those estimates, at least to the extent of making any such appropriation, yet they continue to want money in employing clerk hire in working out these schemes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman deny the statement made by The Adjutant General that he has now proportionately less than one-third the number employed on this particular kind of work than were employed upon the same kind of work after the Spanish War?

Mr. GOOD. The Adjutant General is mistaken there in arriving at those figures. He says he takes into consideration the number of clerks in the Pension Department also; and if the gentleman will get his figures he will see that he takes the number that was employed in The Adjutant General's office and in the Pension Department then, but now he says nothing about the 2,900 clerks in the Bureau of War Risk, reduced now to about 2,000, who were employed on compensation, and if he adds these to his list his argument falls to the ground. Again, The Adjutant General fails to give any credit to labor-saving devices which has so materially lessened the number of clerks that the comparison is worthless.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Here is what he says:

I have less than one-third the number of clerks that were employed on the records of the Army demobilized after the Spanish-American War.

Mr. GOOD. I do not know about that. I thought the gentleman had reference to the general work where he makes the comparison with previous years, and in his comparison of previous years he does include the clerks employed in the Pension Office, but he says in his comparison nothing about the 2,900 clerks in the Bureau of War Risk. If we should make a real comparison, let it embrace all the elements involved.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, certainly they are employed on something else, and if they are not employed they should be discharged.

Mr. GOOD. And with them in the Pension Office the comparison is unfair.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am speaking of this particular work.

Mr. GOOD. I want to go on with this and see where the rest of the \$4,000,000 was allotted. It has not all been expended by any means. From 14 per cent, outside of The Adjutant General's office, to 65 per cent has been expended. In the Bureau of the Chief of Ordnance, where he allotted \$680,000, there remains \$340,000 now, and all of \$340,000 could be transferred to The Adjutant General's office, and that would give more than half what he is asking for. But he will not do it, and why? Does he want to punish the taxpayer or the discharged soldier, or both?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Granting for the sake of argument that it is true that the Secretary of War has made certain allotments to other bureaus in large sums, the fact remains that The Adjutant General is now without funds to do this work, and the question presented to the Congress now is whether we want to delay the prompt settlement of soldiers' claims.

Mr. GOOD. The Secretary of War has funds; let him reallocate it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This money has been heretofore allotted.

Mr. GOOD. The Secretary of War can change the allotments by simply signing his name to the paper.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman know the condition of the allotments at the present time? I do not think we can afford—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask that five minutes more be granted the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think, I will say to the gentleman, that we can afford, merely because the Secretary of War may or may not have allotted too much to some other bureau, to take the position here that in the face of The Adjutant General's positive statement we will take action which will necessarily delay the prompt settlement of soldiers' claims, especially those who are disabled and in need of relief.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman will offer an amendment and his side of the House will support it providing that these unexpended balances of the allotment for the Ordnance Department and in the Secretary's office, where he is conducting the publicity work, shall be used to furnish information for the discharged soldiers, I will support that amendment. But what the gentleman wants us to do is to have this Congress—which has complained and complained severely with regard to the fact that in many bureaus of the War Department clerks have been simply falling over each other because of the large number of clerks—he wants us simply to be compelled to pass a resolution here or a bill that will say, "We were mistaken; that the War Department has not enough force to do the work; what we said was not true." I do not intend to place myself in that position, and I do not believe the House does. I have said the War Department has too many clerks. I believed it when I said it. I believe it now. Now, I want to read to the gentleman what Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, a Democrat, said before the Committee on the Budget with regard to this very thing:

Mr. TAYLOR. The people of the country think that after the war is over we ought to eliminate some of the urgency temporary employees. There is not one of these department heads that will ever cut out any appreciable number, generally speaking. How can we make them economize and stop duplication? Congress would be economical if the departments would do their share.

Now, Mr. Burks answered—Mr. Burks during the war was a major, I think, in the office of the Chief of Staff, and speaks knowingly—

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Not until I finish reading this. Mr. Burks knows what he is talking about, because he spent two years or thereabouts in the office of the War Department, and he said:

Mr. BURKS. I am glad to hear you say that. A month or two ago I was in the Army, and for the last six months I was connected with the General Staff. I will not mention the particular office because I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. BURKS. I saw with my own eyes, day after day, hundreds of clerks who were doing nothing.

Mr. TAYLOR. Everybody sees that. There is one building covering some 15 acres of ground, with three stories, and with 45 acres of clerks in that building, and they probably ought most of them to be sent home.

Mr. BURKS. But at the same time it would have been quite impossible for the head of the division I was working with to determine whether I or anybody else in this organization was unnecessary, for the reason that the information coming to the head of the division was not such as to give him any perspective at all on the amount of work being done or the prospects for the future. He had no perspective on this sort of thing; and when he came to make his estimates for the current year, no doubt, he took the estimates of last year, and he said, "Well, now, here, maybe this thing is going to contract a little, and we had better cut out about 15 per cent and let it go at that." That is probably the way he did it. It emphasizes the fact that you can not get rid of these 25,000 clerks here that are superfluous—

Twenty-five thousand superfluous Government clerks in Washington admitted by a man who was in the office of the Chief of Staff of the War Department, an officer of the Army of the United States; and yet we stand here pledged to economy and by our votes propose to say that the Secretary of War shall continue this waste, inefficiency, and extravagance. I shall not vote for it. I will say to the gentleman I will vote, if necessary; and it may be necessary, it may come to that, that we transfer from the Secretary of War, from the Ordnance and other bureaus of the War Department, these clerks who are not needed there to the office of The Adjutant General. I base my statement upon the showing of a man who was in the office of Chief of Staff and who knows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended two minutes in order to enable me to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I am willing to agree with the gentleman that there are 40 per cent of the clerks in every department in this city who have not got anything on God Almighty's earth to do there, but I want to tell the gentleman this: The secret of the trouble is that we are never going to get rid of these surplus, idle clerks until Members of Congress themselves and the employees' organizations of this city quit meddling in the pie. Every time a department tries to get rid of clerks the clerks go first to their Congressman and then to their clerks' organization, and the Congressman and the organization go back down here and force the department to take them back.

There is where the secret of the trouble is. And until Congress takes some action to send these now useless war clerks home they never are going to be sent home. [Applause.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman tell me that any Congressman on this side of the House could go there and get a man put back to work?

Mr. BLANTON. You have more power with the Republican heads of the departments down there than you imagine.

Mr. GOOD. Now, Mr. Chairman, before the war we had in Washington employees in the War Department to the number of 2,911. That was on April 6, 1917. How many do you think we have now? We have 21,216 clerks; and the war is over. The President told us on the 11th day of November, 1918, a year and a half ago:

The war thus comes to an end, and on terms that the German command can not renew it.

And yet you have to-day, or did have on December 31, 1919, 21,216 clerks in the War Department, and the Secretary of War sends his threat to Congress, with all that number of clerks—and only about 1,100 will lose their jobs if we do not grant this appropriation—that he will not answer the letters of Members of Congress, and he will not furnish to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and other bureaus the information about the discharged soldiers unless we will consent to be held up and grant him the request which he makes, and which would be an indorsement of all of the inefficient work that has been going on in the War Department that Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado has so pointedly called to the attention of Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MERRITT having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3779. An act to authorize the Ozark Forest road-improvement district of Baxter County, Ark., to construct and maintain a bridge across the White River, near Norfolk, Ark.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6863) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHEPHERD, Mr. CALDER, and Mr. SHEPPARD as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the committee to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt but that there are in a number of bureaus and a number of departments of this Government a great many clerks that are not needed. You gentlemen on that side of the aisle are in authority and have a majority, and I assure you I will join hands with you in any effort you may make to cut out useless clerks. But that does not answer the proposition which is now before this committee.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] says that if I will offer an amendment making available all the money which the Secretary of War has allotted to the Chief of Ordnance and to other bureaus in his department for this purpose, he will support it. Gentlemen, there are two reasons why I can not do that and why it would be improper to do that. In the first place, there is no information here—and the gentleman from Iowa said he did not know—as to what parts of these allotments have been expended up to this time.

Mr. GOOD. I have the information.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Even if the gentleman has it, the gentleman is not in a position to say as a Representative—and a responsible Representative in this House—that it would be either proper or feasible to take those allotments, all of them, from those bureaus.

Mr. GOOD. I offered the evidence of Mr. Burke.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As you gentlemen know, the Bureau of Ordnance has or did have hundreds of plants under its control and under its charge. The same is true of other bureaus with reference to work—war work that came over from the war—and everyone realizes that they must have the clerks with which to handle that excess business until it is disposed of. The Director of Purchase and Storage, having hundreds of millions of dollars of Government property to take care of and to dispose of, must have additional clerks for that purpose. And yet the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] would have this Congress take from the Secretary of War and from those bureaus the clerks that he has allotted for the purpose of carrying on that business. But I repeat that does not answer the proposition with which this committee and this House is confronted now, and that is whether we are going to deny to The Adjutant General the money and the clerks which he says are absolutely necessary in order to enable him to furnish not only you, the Representatives of the people, but the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, the Auditor of the War Department, the Director of Finance, and the Vocational Board, the information necessary for the prompt settlement of these claims of disabled soldiers and these claims for equipment, and so forth.

If the cry comes hereafter that these claims are not being settled, then the majority of this House must take the responsibility before the country and before these soldiers for their failure to provide the necessary money.

I am as much in favor of economy as the gentleman from Iowa or any other Member of this House, but I do not want to see this House deliberately cripple any activity of this Government which is necessary, and especially an activity which deals with those soldiers who fought so gloriously for their country during the Great War and who have returned home disabled and who need support and compensation from the Government.

Now, the gentleman from Iowa says that the Secretary of War has delivered a threat to the effect that he will not answer

your letters. I challenge that statement. The Secretary of War and The Adjutant General stated to the committee frankly that they could not answer your letters; that they could not give you the information as to official records of soldiers unless you gave them the clerks with which to do that. They said that unless this authorization was given they would be powerless to respond to the requests of Representatives. If you gentlemen are willing to take the responsibility of seeing that these claims are delayed and these soldiers do not receive the attention to which they are entitled, then the responsibility is yours.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. GOOD. I will read to the gentleman a paragraph that seems to me contains even more than a veiled threat:

Unless relief is afforded either by an additional appropriation by the enactment of legislation permitting the use of the \$3,500,000 appropriation as suggested it will be necessary for me to direct The Adjutant General to suspend at once all work connected with records of the demobilized Army. This will mean a cessation of all work connected with furnishing information from these records to the Director of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, the Federal Board for Vocational Training, the Director of Finance, the Auditor for the War Department, and other public officials of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for two minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is exactly what I said to the gentleman.

Mr. GOOD. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I submit it to any member of this committee if that constitutes a threat. He said that if you do this thing it will be necessary for him to issue these orders. The gentleman from Iowa talks about the number of clerks employed. It may be there are too many clerks, and I have no doubt that there are too many in many of the departments of this Government, but I deny that The Adjutant General has at the present time too many. The Adjutant General has met the requests of Members of Congress, and has answered twenty-five and thirty thousand communications a day to various bureaus of this Government which have to do with soldiers, and his own letter here shows, and it can not be successfully contradicted, that by reason of the efficiency in that office and the approved methods which he has put in, he has now proportionately less than one-third of the number of employees at work upon the records of the members of the demobilized Army than were employed after the Spanish-American War.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves to strike out the last three words.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any reason for our getting agitated over this question. I believe that in the hearing The Adjutant General presented a case justifying action by the Congress. The majority of the committee thought otherwise, and certainly I shall offer no amendment to remedy the situation unless the chairman of the committee decides to approve it.

But the situation is this: The request of The Adjutant General would mean an expenditure for the purpose of furnishing information to the War Risk Bureau and to the Zone Finance Officer of \$674,000. The gentleman from Iowa thinks it unnecessary.

I will say here that no man on either side of the House works more energetically and more effectively for real economy than does the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]. If he ever errs it is going to be on the side of too much economy in his anxiety to cut down the expenditures as much as possible. But I am satisfied that if he will carefully consider this matter he will see that it is impossible to remedy this situation, unless an amendment is agreed to, as suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee. Upon the hearings it developed that instead of the Secretary of War being able to use any part of the \$4,000,000 fund for this work in The Adjutant General's Office, he had made an inquiry, as the records show, of each bureau in the department, and instead of their having funds available for this purpose it is probable that there will be a deficit in some of the other bureaus. Now, on page 280 of the hearings there is set forth the unexpended balance in each bureau.

The gentleman from Iowa referred to the amount which was allotted to the Ordnance Bureau, which he thinks should be

given to the office of The Adjutant General if they really need it. The balance left in the Bureau of Ordnance on January 1 was only \$276,000, and therefore if the Secretary of War took from that bureau every dollar that it has, it would not enable The Adjutant General to furnish the information that he is required to furnish to the War Risk Bureau and the Zone Finance Officer for more than two months of the five months that remain of this fiscal year.

The gentleman says that money has been spent extravagantly in the War Department, and states that a publicity department has been established, and that money could be saved by abolishing that. He is mistaken about that. It is not an extravagance. Heretofore in each bureau a clerk has been assigned to the duty of giving out information as to the work of each bureau, answering the inquiries of the press and the people. Recently, in order to economize, one man was detailed in the Secretary's office to give out information as to all bureaus, and as a result it is economy instead of extravagance.

Now, the statement made by Mr. Burke, quoted in the budget hearings, is really not relevant to this matter at all. Men will always differ as to the amount and quality of work done by others in the same department, but the fact to-day is that The Adjutant General is confronted with the fact that he must daily furnish, on the average, sometimes as high as 25,000 answers for requests for the service records of men to the War Department, to the zone finance officer, and to the War Risk Bureau, and during a period of three days 67,000 such answers were required.

The gentleman says that with the cessation of war, when the President declared the war was over, conditions had changed, and we ought to reduce these clerks. But when you stop to think of the character of the work that is done in the office of The Adjutant General you will see that that work has not been reduced. None of these requests from the War Risk Bureau, amounting, I have said, to 67,000 in three days, came until after the signing of the armistice, and this is true of requests from the zone finance officer. This work has arisen since demobilization. The requests have so increased as to demand that The Adjutant General assign clerks to this work.

The gentleman says that the clerks now engaged in the active Army should be assigned to this work. Out of this \$4,000,000 fund 517 clerks are allotted to The Adjutant General's Office, in addition to four hundred and some odd who are carried on the statutory roll. But where in 1914 we had an Army of less than 100,000 men, to-day we have an Army of 220,000, and if The Adjutant General attempted to reduce this force of 1,000 clerks he never could attend to the work that the active Army now requires. Therefore he must leave those clerks on the work of the active Army and will be unable to answer these requests of the War Risk Bureau and the zone finance office.

If the gentleman from Iowa can find any unused funds and will draw an amendment making it available, I will join with him, because this does not carry an appropriation. It provides for the use of funds out of this same \$4,000,000 fund that has been allotted to draft records and to the office that furnishes information to the Attorney General.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman understands, however, that it will be necessary to make subsequent appropriations for the draft records.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes. I was going to add that. I would not leave the impression that this would not mean an additional appropriation later, because this draft work will have to be completed. But it is only a question as to where The Adjutant General can get this money. He has got to have it. He can not take those 450 or 500 clerks away from the work of the active Army. The gentleman thinks he can get it from the Ordnance Bureau. But the record shows, as I have already said, that only \$276,000 was left on the 1st of January in the Ordnance Bureau, and if he tried he could not get along without an addition of between \$400,000 and \$500,000 between now and the end of the year. The responsibility rests upon every man on the floor of this House. It is not a partisan question. It is a question that every Member of this House is interested in, and I hope that if the gentleman from Iowa can not offer or agree to an amendment such as was suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] before the bill is finally disposed of he will frame some amendment diverting from the bureaus he says has surplus funds the money necessary to take care of this

important work that is asked for by The Adjutant General's Office.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] if they are willing to accept this as an amendment, in view of the fact that the Secretary has \$1,195,000 of the \$4,000,000 unexpended:

The Secretary of War shall reallocate the appropriation of \$4,000,000 for temporary employees in the War Department in such manner as will provide an allotment of \$500,000 for the office of The Adjutant General in addition to the allotments already made for that office for the current fiscal year for work in connection with the records of the demobilized army.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is not the amount of money that he says will be necessary.

Mr. GOOD. I know it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman knows full well that there is quite a controversy between the Bureau of Efficiency and The Adjutant General with regard to the inefficient methods that are employed in that work. The Committee on Appropriations has gone into that somewhat, but, of course, can not decide the matter. I do feel in a general way that there might be some reduction in the force in The Adjutant General's Office without a reduction in the results. Now, this gives him \$500,000 out of almost \$1,200,000 unexpended. Of that I will say to the gentleman that \$276,000 is in the Ordnance Department, \$26,000 in the Motor Transportation Force, and \$15,000 in the Chemical Warfare Division. Why in the name of common sense have we now officers, clerks, and men working on chemical warfare, emergency employees, 18 months after the war is over?

The gentleman knows full well that the amendment he proposes to offer is subject to a point of order. I am perfectly willing and will do all I can to give The Adjutant General the money to furnish the information with regard to the records of the demobilized armies, but I do insist that these other bureaus of the War Department shall not be permitted to continue in this course of reckless extravagance. If the Secretary of War will not make a fair and just allotment so as to continue furnishing information most desired, why does the Secretary of War want to deny the discharged soldiers the service they are entitled to? Is that the way he feels toward them, that he would prefer to keep useless and unnecessary employees in other bureaus while he would discharge the clerks and refuse to give any information as to the discharged soldiers?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I should have no objection to agreeing to support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] if I had any information at all that would cause me to doubt the accuracy of the statement of the Secretary of War that the amounts allotted to these other bureaus would be expended; but now let me call the attention of the gentleman to the facts. Why they should need money to expend in the Division of Chemical Warfare I do not know, but I can readily conceive that they will need that \$15,000. I believe there ought to be some chemical warfare organization in the War Department, and that it is necessary to maintain the bureau, just as it is necessary to maintain the Coast Artillery in time of peace. If you do not maintain them in time of peace, you will not have them when war comes. You can not start after you engage in war.

Manifestly we can not reduce the amount in the Surgeon General's Office, and we have no reason for believing that the \$145,000 there can be reduced, or the \$29,000 in the office of the Chief of Engineers, or the \$27,000 in the Signal Office, and plainly we would be taking charge of the administration of the department and allotting money to one bureau without regard to the necessities of others, whereas the two items named in the estimate submitted by the department can be drawn upon.

I do not agree with the gentleman's statement about extravagance in The Adjutant General's Office. I do not think the gentleman from Iowa means to charge that that particular office has been extravagant. The Adjutant General explained to the committee how each day officers were sent through the different divisions of that office to ascertain whether clerks were at work, and there is no proof to justify any charge that there are any unnecessary clerks in The Adjutant General's Office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he is willing to support this proposition?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa in all frankness that I do not think this House, with the information that was before the committee and with the information that it has, can afford to undertake to absolutely strip the Director of Purchase and Storage, for instance, the Bureau of Ordnance, and other bureaus of the clerks which the Secretary of War feels it is necessary they should have.

Mr. GOOD. That would not be necessary.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If these clerks are not necessary, the gentleman should take the responsibility of offering an amendment, after due investigation, to cut out these clerks. I do not think we ought to rob Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. GOOD. They have now practically \$1,200,000 unexpended of this \$4,000,000. Now, if we give the Secretary of War discretion to make the reallocation of \$500,000 out of that \$1,200,000, he will still have \$700,000 left of a lump sum over and above his \$1,200,000 unexpended for his regular establishment. Nobody can be injured by doing that.

Mr. BYRNS of South Carolina. Did I understand the gentleman from Iowa to say the Secretary of War would have \$700,000 additional?

Mr. GOOD. After we take out the \$500,000 he will still have \$700,000 left.

Mr. BYRNS of South Carolina. If he should take back from these different bureaus the money he has allotted to them?

Mr. GOOD. No; if he should take the \$500,000 and reallocate it, he could take it from any bureau that he saw fit and give it to The Adjutant General to do the work for the demobilized Army, and then he would still have a sum lacking \$5,000 of \$700,000 for the rest of these bureaus in addition to his regular statutory force.

Mr. BYRNS of South Carolina. To do that he would have to close up other bureaus.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But \$314,000 of that \$1,200,000 is now allotted to The Adjutant General, and the result would be that you would cut him down to about \$300,000 for allotments to these other bureaus.

Mr. GOOD. I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: Page 15, after line 4, insert:

"ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE.

"The Secretary of War shall reallocate the appropriation of \$4,000,000 for temporary employees in the War Department in such manner as will provide an allotment of \$500,000 for the office of The Adjutant General in addition to the allotments already made for that office for the current fiscal year for work in connection with records of the demobilized army."

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. GOOD. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will not permit us to find out something about this, I will make the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Well, make it, then.

Mr. BLANTON. It is unauthorized by law, is not a deficiency, and is not germane to the bill.

Mr. GOOD. I ask for a ruling.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to discuss it.

Mr. GOOD. We have already discussed it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order against the amendment. Will the gentleman from Iowa cite the Chair to any law authorizing this appropriation?

Mr. BLANTON. I can give the gentleman a little light. Will the Chairman permit me to ask him a question? If so, I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, I make the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the amendment simply seeks to give authority to employ more clerks in the War Department. Under the organic law creating the War Department authority is given to Congress to make appropriations to provide the clerical assistance necessary to carry on the business in that department. That is all this is. It has been ruled hundreds of times that any amendment seeking to add to the

number of clerks in a department is in order, because certainly Congress has the authority to furnish the department with the necessary machinery in the way of clerks to conduct its business. Therefore it seems to me that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee having admitted that it was subject to a point of order—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations does not decide these matters. It is a question for the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard a moment on the point of order. In the first place, the chairman of the committee admits that the amendment is subject to a point of order. In the second place, there is no law authorizing the Secretary of War, after an allotment has been made, to reallocate the various sums among the various departments. In the third place, as a matter of fact, there are employed in the War Department to-day so many clerks that every morning the heads of the departments have to tell them to make five minutes' work last all day in order that they may apparently have something to do. Because of that fact, unless I can ask a question I shall insist on the point of order. It is not authorized by law, it is not a deficiency, and it is not germane.

Mr. WALSH. Are those the only grounds upon which the gentleman bases the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I think that is sufficient.

Mr. WALSH. It is certainly authorized by law for Congress to appropriate for this force. Under a former ruling of the Chair it comes within the rule of deficiencies, and certainly it is germane to the provisions of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas states numerous grounds for his point of order against the paragraph in question, but to the mind of the Chair he does not make the point of order that is apparent on the face of the amendment, unless by saying that it is not authorized by law he means that it introduces new legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. If it is unauthorized by law, it is certainly new legislation. If the Chair did not understand that, I make that point now.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not necessarily follow, but if that is what the gentleman means, the Chair sustains the point of order on that ground.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 15, after line 4, insert:

"So much of the appropriation of \$3,500,000 not necessary for the care and custody of the draft records and for the employment of clerical assistance for the purpose of furnishing to adjutants general of States statements of service of soldiers who served in the war with Germany shall be available for the employment of the clerical assistance necessary for the purpose of furnishing such information from the records of the demobilized army as may be properly furnished to public officials, former soldiers, and other persons entitled to receive it."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane, that it is new legislation, and that it is unauthorized by law.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Has the gentleman from Texas now included all the points of order that he expects to make on this amendment?

Mr. BLANTON. If they are not sufficient, I expect to make some more if necessary. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have no doubt the gentleman will if he gets a cue from the Chair, as he did a moment ago.

Mr. BLANTON. The only difference is that when I get a line from the Chair I am able to know it and act on it, and sometimes the gentleman from Tennessee might not be able to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, I will leave that to the judgment of the House. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, it seems to me, is not subject to a point of order. It is in no sense new legislation. As the Chair intimated a while ago and as I attempted to argue, the House certainly has authority to add to the clerical force of the War Department. That has been held any number of times; in fact, every time the point has ever been raised. The House certainly has authority to give the War Department the clerical assistance it needs. This does not seek to make any

new appropriation, but simply provides that out of the appropriation now in the Treasury the Secretary may use such funds as are not needed for other specific work for clerks to do this work.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman, as the law now stands, would the Secretary of War be authorized to do what the gentleman is seeking to have him do?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Secretary of War would not be so authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. Would he be authorized if this amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee should be placed in the bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Undoubtedly he would—

Mr. BLANTON. Then it is new legislation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I could offer an amendment appropriating \$674,000 for the purpose of employing additional clerks in The Adjutant General's Office and it would be in order. Instead of doing that, I am asking the adoption of an amendment which authorizes \$674,000 already appropriated to be used for the employment of the same clerks.

I respectfully insist that the question asked by the Chair and my answer by no means determines the point of order. This simply provides for the employment of additional clerks. I take it that the Chair would not hold that an amendment offered to this bill providing for additional clerks would be subject to a point of order, and that is all this does, except that it does not make a direct appropriation, but authorizes money already appropriated to be so expended.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Under the law as it now is, could not the Secretary of War detail clerks from one bureau to another?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Unquestionably.

Mr. CANNON. And is there not authority of law to detail clerks from one department to another?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know what the truth is, but it seems to be admitted that clerks are scattered here and there where they are not needed. Is not this a matter for administration?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think so, and that is the whole point of contention. The Secretary of War states that unless this authorization is given he will not have authority to employ clerks and will not have clerks with which he can do this particular work. Somebody has to answer the question and we have to trust somebody. The Secretary of War is on record as saying that he has not in his department clerks that he can put upon this work to continue to perform this service.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this discussion is not on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is hearing the gentleman from Tennessee, and it seems to the Chair that it is pertinent to the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. The Secretary of War, it is not controverted, has in his department more clerks than he needs, presumably trained clerks. If he has to employ from the outside new clerks they would have to be instructed, and that would be a matter of months. If it be true that the Secretary of War has useless clerks with full power to detail from one bureau to another, with the President having full power to authorize the detail from one department to another, why can not what the gentleman is seeking be accomplished through administration? I am asking this in the greatest good faith. I think this work is all-important, and it seems to me that with proper administration a new arrangement of Cabinet officers might be wise; but as I am not President and as he does not ask me for advice, I merely make the suggestion.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Illinois is assuming that the War Department has too many clerks. I am not willing to make that assumption in view of the direct and positive statement made by the Secretary of War that he has not the number of clerks to detail to this work to perform it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman from Tennessee know how many clerks are employed in filing and taking care of the draft records?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As I remember it, there are 1,290 clerks employed in this particular service of furnishing information in respect to the official records to the various bureaus and the Members of the House and the Senate.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will state that, in my judgment, whatever number there may be employed there could be very safely transferred to The Adjutant General's Office to do this necessary work, because Gen. Crowder,

when the question was put to him as to what should be done with the draft records—that is, the questionnaires—stated they could be disposed of in one of three ways.

They could be left in the various precincts and counties or they could be turned over to the adjutants general of the various States, or they could be sent to the War Department. The War Department—for some reason never explained to me, and I can see no earthly sense in it—ordered those draft records shipped here to Washington, and no doubt they have hundreds of clerks down there working on that useless task.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. In substance I received a letter from some one, I do not recollect whom, informing me that if I would request the Secretary of War, he would send to me the names of everyone in my district who was enlisted for the draft and everybody who was enlisted in the Army, for my use. I just put that advice in the wastebasket.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That does not involve the use of any great number of clerks, because, as I understand it, these are photostatic copies of the various records.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Did I understand correctly a moment ago that it was possible to transfer clerks from, we will say, for illustration, the Navy Department over to the War Department?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the Executive has the authority to do that. Of course, the Secretary of the Navy could not do it.

Mr. BEGG. But there is authority for the transfer?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Under the Overman Act; yes.

Mr. BEGG. The head of one of the departments in the War Risk Insurance Bureau stated a few weeks ago that he had 400 clerks he tried to fire or tried to find somebody to take, and he was unable to do either. He could not find anybody to take them and he could not find any authority to discharge them. He had nothing for them to do. Would it not be economical and good business policy to absorb some of the surplus?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Suppose they were transferred, from what are they going to be paid? That is just what is wanted. It is desired to give the War Department funds to pay for these clerks.

Mr. BEGG. We could very easily do that, if it was not for the gentleman's own side.

Mr. DENISON. They could be paid from the same fund they are paid from now.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are discharging clerks in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. UPSHAW. I simply want to ask the gentleman if it is true that The Adjutant General wants more clerks to do the work needed or wants more money to pay those he has?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He wishes funds to pay those he already has.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this discussion is not on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, by way of a new section, providing that—

so much of the appropriation of \$3,500,000 not necessary for the care and custody of the draft records and for the employment of clerical assistance for the purpose of furnishing to adjutants general of States statements of service of soldiers who served in the war with Germany shall be available for the employment of the clerical assistance necessary for the purpose of furnishing such information from the records of the demobilized army as may be properly furnished to public officials, former soldiers, and other persons entitled to receive it.

It appears from the language of this amendment that an appropriation of three and a half million dollars was heretofore made for a specific purpose and that it is now desired that the Secretary of War may use it for a different purpose.

It seems to the Chair that the entire purpose of the amendment is to authorize the Secretary of War to do something which, without the amendment, he has not authority to do. If such is the effect of the proposed amendment, it is in contravention of the rule. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BANKHEAD: Page 15, after line 4, add the following: "For additional clerical assistance in the Office of The Adjutant General, \$674,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is new legislation, it is not authorized by law, and not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be heard for two minutes on the merits of the proposition.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. BANKHEAD. I object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not do that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, clearly it is new legislation, clearly it is unauthorized by law, clearly it is not germane to this deficiency bill, and I submit it without argument.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the Chair desire to hear from me on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be very glad to hear the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, we are making an appropriation here under this specific title for the War Department. It is true there is no specific item in this section to which this is offered as an amendment for the office of The Adjutant General. As I understand it, we are appropriating here for deficiencies in all branches of the Government service, including the War Department. This is a specific amendment for additional clerical assistance in the office of The Adjutant General of the Army, which certainly comes under the War Department service. Under the ruling heretofore made by the Chair on the question of what constitutes a deficiency I do not think it is necessary to discuss that phase of the point of order. Congress certainly has authority to appropriate money for clerical assistance in any branch of the War Department of the United States under general law, and this is simply adding an item to the general deficiency as represented here as needed by the argument which has preceded the offering of the amendment and in the hearings before the committee and by the letter from the Secretary of War and The Adjutant General, which are already of evidence in the RECORD.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. In just a moment. Certainly it is germane to an appropriation for the War Department. Because, forsooth, the committee did not include any particular item or fixed item for the office of The Adjutant General of the Army does not under the rule preclude the offering of the amendment for a purpose of that sort. I will now be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that the amendment which he offers is germane to the paragraph that is under consideration?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, I hope it is; that is the argument I am making.

Mr. WALSH. Providing for the Aqueduct Bridge under the Engineer Department?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am adding a separate and distinct item.

Mr. WALSH. But he is offering an amendment to the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If it makes any difference, I will offer it as a new section. It does not seem to me that goes to the merit of the argument. I do not think that changes—

Mr. WALSH. It will not cure it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The philosophy of the argument at all. If it is good, it is good as an amendment just as in a separate paragraph.

Mr. WALSH. It can not be offered as a germane amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is all I desire to say on the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard? If not, the Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] offers an amendment, on page 15, after line 4, as a new paragraph, providing for additional clerical assistance in the office of The Adjutant General. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] makes the point of order that it is new legislation, that it is not provided for by law, that it is not a deficiency, and that it is not germane.

Mr. BLANTON. And not germane to the preceding paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. As to the first three contentions of the gentleman from Texas, the Chair believes that the proposed amendment is not new legislation, that it is for a deficiency, and that it is for a purpose authorized by existing law.

The question of germaneness remains and is, in the opinion of the Chair, the sole and controlling question in connection with this amendment. Some 40 years ago, Mr. Carlisle, later an honored Speaker of this House, when occupying this chair as Chair-

man of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, made a ruling on the subject of germaneness which has been quite generally followed since that time. I quote briefly from the ruling of Mr. Carlisle, found in Fifth Hinds' Precedents, 5825, where he said:

While a committee may report a bill embracing different subjects, it is not in order during consideration in the House to introduce a new subject by way of amendment.

This is, of course, only an application of the rule as it now exists that no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of an amendment. He further said:

The rule does not prohibit a committee reporting a bill from embracing in it as many different subjects as it may choose; but after the bill has been reported to the House no different subject can be introduced into it by amendment. When, therefore, it is objected that a proposed amendment is not in order because it is not germane, the meaning of the objection is simply that it—the proposed amendment—is a motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration.

It is not always easy to determine just what is a new subject. Does the proposed amendment introduce a subject different from that under consideration? Let us examine the context of the bill. The preceding section is under the head of "War Department, Engineer Department," and provides for an additional appropriation for the Aqueduct Bridge. The following item is also under the head of "War Department for public buildings and grounds." There is no reference in the bill anywhere to The Adjutant General's Office and no provision is made for it in this bill, so far as the Chair is able to determine. It would seem to be the contention of the gentleman from Alabama that because the committee could have brought in an item on this bill providing for an appropriation, therefore any Member on the floor of the House has the same right to bring in the same item by way of amendment.

The present occupant of the chair can not bring himself into accord with this argument. I agree with the ruling of Mr. Carlisle that a committee may bring in a bill containing any number of items entirely in order for the committee to bring in, but which an individual on the floor of the House can not offer by way of amendment. One reason for this is that the committee holds hearings and considers the evidence pro and con on such matters as may be brought to the attention of the committee by the estimates in the regular way. After considering the estimates the committee makes up its bill. The bill is reported to the House, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and printed for the information of the Members. Under the rules of the House Members have a right to assume upon examining the bill that it contains the matters that are going to be considered when the bill is brought before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration, and that no different subject will be considered. In order to protect the Members in this right the rules prescribe that no new subject shall be brought in under color of an amendment.

It seems to the Chair that, in order to insure orderly procedure in the transaction of the business of the House, to protect Members against surprise by reason of new subjects being brought in under color of amendments which have not received the consideration of any committee and which other Members have not had an opportunity to examine, questions of germaneness should be somewhat strictly construed.

The Chair quotes from a ruling made by Chairman John J. Fitzgerald, in which he quotes from and follows the ruling of Mr. Carlisle. Chairman Fitzgerald said:

The object of the rule requiring amendments to be germane—and such a rule has been adopted in practically every legislative body in the United States—is in the interest of orderly legislation. Its purpose is to prevent hasty and ill-considered legislation, to prevent propositions being presented for the consideration of the body which might not reasonably be anticipated, and for which the body might not be properly prepared.

It seems to the Chair that the reasoning of Chairman Fitzgerald is preeminently sound, and the precedent made by him one to be followed in the interest of orderly legislation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Chair indulge me a moment in order that we may have a clear understanding of the interpretation? Is the Chair of the opinion that an amendment could be offered from the floor by the committee covering this subject, or that it would have to be reported by the committee in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. A member of the committee on the floor, in the view of the Chair, would have no greater privilege in this regard than any other Member of the House. The committee in reporting out a bill, however, could bring in many propositions that might not be in order if presented by a Member on the floor of the House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then, according to that interpretation, no item except that which is specifically brought in in the bill, under the head of the War Department, would be germane?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not accept the interpretation of the gentleman, but does hold that an item which introduces a new subject would not be in order if presented by a Member from the floor. Believing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama to be one that would introduce a subject different from that under consideration, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Virginia rise?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. To move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the debate on yesterday relating to the Secretary of the Treasury, and his action in the Speedway Hospital matter, a great deal of material was put into the RECORD, so much material indeed that it is hard to pick out the wheat from the chaff. To separate the real issue from the extraneous matter.

I desire to include as a part of my remarks certain extracts from the original act of authorization, and the contract which was filed on yesterday so as to direct the attention of anyone who may be interested in arriving at the right of this controversy, to the very crux of the matter. I wish to include in my remarks, and I ask unanimous consent that this may be done, subsections a and b, of the original act, No. 326, Sixty-fifth Congress. These subsections give the authorization in detail, and fix the limit of \$3,000,000 upon the contract. In subsection a the Secretary of the Treasury is empowered to take over certain land and execute a contract for the construction of certain hospital buildings, at a total limit of cost not to exceed \$3,000,000. In subsection b it is further provided that whatever he may do in respect to carrying into effect the authorization of subsection a, he must keep within the limits of cost authorized in that subsection.

Juxtaposition with these subsections I desire to include further, as a part of my remarks, section 9 of the contract that was introduced on yesterday by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the way indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Following are subsections a and b:

a. At Cook County, Ill., by taking over the land and executing the contract for the construction thereon of hospital buildings specified therein of a certain proposed contract executed by the Shank Co., August 31, 1918, and in accordance with such contract and the plans and specifications identified in connection therewith August 31, 1918, by the signature and initials of Brig. Gen. R. C. Marshall, jr., Construction Division Quartermaster Department, United States Army, by Lieut. Col. C. C. Wright, and the Shank Co., by George H. Shank, president, at the cost stated therein, namely, \$2,500,000, with such changes in said plans and specifications as may be required by the Secretary of the Treasury to adapt said specified buildings to the needs and purposes of the Public Health Service, at a total limit of cost not to exceed \$3,000,000.

b. In carrying the foregoing authorization into effect, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to execute the contract with the Shank Co. hereinbefore specified, with such verbal changes as are made necessary by a change in the contracting officers, and to assume all obligations in said contract contained, and to purchase materials and labor in the open market, or otherwise, and to employ laborers and mechanics for the construction of such buildings and their equipment as in his judgment shall best meet the public exigencies, within the limits of cost herein authorized.

The following is section 9 of the contract:

9. It is understood that the contract price hereof is based upon well-established union scales of wages for labor as of August 26, 1918, and upon the prices for materials which the owner agrees to advise the contracting officer of through the delivery to his representative upon the ground, within 15 days from the date hereof, of a complete schedule of all materials to be used in the construction of said buildings and structures and the price at which the same are contracted for, together with such other data as the contracting officer may require in connection therewith at the time, and the delivery of such schedules shall be of the essence of the agreement relating to said materials contained in this clause. Should the owner during the course of the construction of said buildings and structures be required by any increase in such union wage scales or in the market price of such materials to expend more money for the completion of said buildings and structures than that upon which its present contract price is based, then it shall first notify the contracting officer of such fact and, upon 24 hours' notice to the owner, the contracting officer may from time to time elect to furnish and furnish such materials to the owner in quantities provided for in the plans and specifications, in which event there shall be deducted by the contracting officer from the contract price hereof a sum equal to the total value of any such materials so furnished to the owner based upon the prices set forth in said schedule. In the event the contracting officer does not within 24 hours after the receipt of such notice of increased cost of materials elect to furnish and within a reasonable time furnish the same, then the owner shall proceed to purchase

such necessary materials, and the amount of such increase so required to be paid by the owner shall be reimbursed to the owner by the Government in addition to the contract price herein named. All savings made by the owner through the purchase of materials at prices less than those appearing in the schedule shall be credited upon the contract price hereof, and the contracting officer shall deduct from any sums due the owner an amount equal to all such savings. After approval by the contracting officer of increases in wages to laborers, the owner shall be reimbursed in the amount necessarily paid by it on account of increased wages. In case any controversy shall arise hereunder as to the amount of such increase in the cost of labor or of materials, then such amount, if any, shall be determined by the contracting officer. The owner shall not, however, make any departure from the standard rate of wages being paid in that locality without the prior consent of the contracting officer and shall not attempt to secure labor at the expense of other Government work.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Now, Mr. Chairman, if there is any point to the criticism that was leveled on yesterday at the Secretary of the Treasury, it was that he had failed, either contumaciously or ignorantly, to do something which the Congress had authorized him to do. Congress authorized him to enter into a contract in relation to the construction of this Speedway Hospital, and expressly fixed the limit of his authority in that respect to an expenditure not to exceed \$3,000,000. See subsections a and b. If the Secretary of the Treasury had been presented with and asked to sign a sufficient contract, in conformity with subsections a and b, and he had refused to sign such a contract, then the Secretary of the Treasury would be properly amenable to the criticism that has been directed against him by the gentleman from South Dakota and the gentleman from Iowa. As the matter stands, he is entitled to an apology from these gentlemen. On the other hand, if the Secretary of the Treasury has refused to sign a contract imposing upon the Government a contract obligation in excess of the cost limit of \$3,000,000, then, so far from being a proper subject of criticism, he deserves to receive and should receive the applause and approbation of the Members on both sides of the Chamber, as a faithful and honorable public servant, worthy of our plaudits. [Applause.]

I have put these citations into the RECORD to enable the Members on both sides of the Chamber—Democrats and Republicans alike—to arrive at the merits of this controversy, relieved of all encumbering and extraneous matter.

The burden of the indictment in this matter was upon the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], and in the effort to carry that burden he introduced into the RECORD on yesterday a contract which he invited the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] to cause the Secretary to sign, should the Secretary of the Treasury without further authorization sign that contract, containing section 9 providing for an increase in the cost limit of the authorization to an indefinite extent that in the result might amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars, he ought to be impeached. [Applause.] I make that broad statement, because that section 9, of that contract boldly and unblushingly provides for a liability to the contractor; that as stated, may be greatly in excess of the definitely prescribed cost limit of \$3,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I ask for two minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. So far from undertaking to complete the contract with relation to the hospital within the original cost limit of \$3,000,000, the contractor submits a contract under which, should it be signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Government has to pay whatever amount may be added to the original cost limit by the expanding cost of labor and materials. Section 9 as cited, is precisely to that effect. So, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Dakota has failed to make good his charge of ignorance, or contumacy. No contract conforming to the authorization has been presented to the Secretary of the Treasury. He has very properly refused to sign any other. If it is desired that he should sign a contract carrying a greater cost limit, a bill or joint resolution to that effect should be introduced and passed. To the present time the attitude of the Secretary of the Treasury has been that of a high-minded, honorable public servant, and it deserves the fullest degree of commendation, not criticism. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

The appropriation contained in section 4 of the act approved December 5, 1919, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia,' approved February

28, 1901, and for other purposes." shall be paid one-half out of the Treasury of the United States and one-half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. VARE. On the subject of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the chairman a question, if I may, on that.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I want to ask the chairman one question, if I may?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. I wanted to ask the chairman what effect the passage of this paragraph would have upon the action of this House, taken recently, in passing a bill doing away with the old half-and-half system?

Mr. GOOD. It would save the United States about \$14,000 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. What effect would that have on the bill that the House passed? I mean the bill that the House recently passed and sent to the Senate?

Mr. GOOD. It does not affect that at all. There was a mistake in the bill that was passed some time ago and became a law in regard to the Metropolitan police. It provided that the park police, who are under the control of the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, where the salaries have been paid one-half out of the Treasury of the United States and one-half out of the District revenues, should all be paid out of the Treasury of the United States. This provides that one-half should be paid, as formerly, out of the District revenues.

Mr. BLANTON. If we do not pass this paragraph, and if the bill passed by the House some time ago doing away with the half-and-half system is passed by the Senate and becomes a law, then will the police be paid in accordance with this paragraph?

Mr. GOOD. No; because the law provides specifically that the total salary of these men shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. Why should the police of Washington be paid half out of the money of the people of the United States?

Mr. GOOD. That is the law now. But if we do not adopt this the park policemen will be paid wholly out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. All?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And it will not be changed by this bill that we have passed, which the House passed? The gentleman knows what was in that bill doing away with the half-and-half system?

Mr. GOOD. I can not tell the gentleman what will be in the law when it is finally enacted.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the policemen will be paid half and half?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This only makes provision for the present year.

Mr. BLANTON. In that case, Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my reservation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE], does the gentleman desire to discuss some item in the bill?

Mr. VARE. I desire to discuss the bill generally, and in particular one item.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, the second general deficiency bill now pending before this body carries a total appropriation of \$88,684,342.14, and the report of the committee indicates that there has been a reduction in round figures of \$29,000,000.

No Member of this House is more willing to give the committee credit for economy than I am. I am in favor as a general policy of carrying out that principle, namely, that the funds of the Public Treasury shall be conserved. But in order to reduce this bill by \$29,000,000 I can not overlook the fact that in reaching that figure there has been eliminated, or rather there has been withheld from this bill, an appropriation of \$9,300,000 requested by the Secretary of the Navy. In his letter to the Speaker of the House under date of January 21 the Secretary of the Navy includes recommendations from Admiral Coontz, Admiral Taylor, Admiral Griffin, and Admiral Parks showing the extreme importance of making this appropriation at this time.

This House last year included these very identical items. The distinguished chairman of this committee, Mr. Goop, stood on the floor of this House and urged their adoption, and the items were placed in the bill, but were taken out by the Senate.

As a Member representing a great navy-yard district, I have seen these battleships returned from military service, and I have seen them anchored in the reserve basin at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. They are there now. The great battleship named in honor of the State of Connecticut, which the chairman now presiding over the committee so well represents, is in the reserve dock. If a call were issued to-morrow, she could not move, not because of a shortage of the crew but because she has been disabled, and she has been lying there disabled for the last eight months. The battleship named in honor of the State of Louisiana is there, and she is disabled. Likewise the battleships *Michigan*, *Minnesota*, *Kansas*, and *New Hampshire*, and more than 100 others, including destroyers and ships of the first class.

In addition to the ships now in commission, during the coming fiscal year 17 dreadnoughts, 13 predreadnoughts, 8 armored cruisers, 18 protected cruisers, and other ships of smaller classes will be placed into service. It will be necessary to keep them in fighting condition. The appropriation for repair of vessels is one absolutely necessary for the proper maintenance of the Navy as a fighting machine. It is imperative that our Navy be kept in first-class condition at all times. Any depreciation impairs its potential strength and our national safety.

We hear much of the charges that the Navy was not in proper condition to enter the war zone when the United States declared war on Germany. If that charge be true and it is attested to by one of the foremost admirals in the Navy, Admiral Sims, the condition resulted from such a lack of foresight in the Navy Department as we would demonstrate here in Congress to-day if we fail to pass the amendments to be offered here. Where is the Member of this House who has talked about preparedness year after year? Where is the man who will stand up here and say that it is good economy to allow these valuable ships to be in a state of deterioration in the face of the highest recommendation that we have to have the same repaired?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. VARE. I regret that I can not yield at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. VARE. The Philadelphia Inquirer of a recent date, speaking on the policy of economy, said as follows:

A MISTAKEN PIECE OF ECONOMY.

Economy is a word above all others for Congress to heed just now, but false economy is too often extravagance. The refusal of the Appropriations Committee of the House to sanction the request of the Navy Department for \$10,000,000 for repairs to ships is an example of this. Were there no other items that could be cut instead?

A fleet on paper is no fleet at all. To lay up capital ships for lack of repairs, to discharge thousands of skilled workmen on whose labors the efficiency of the Navy depends, is to strike at a vital spot in the national means of defense.

Cutting the coat to fit the cloth need not be a bungling job.

The Navy has found it difficult to get enlisted men to serve who are skilled in trades. This has contributed to the poor condition of the ships in many cases. With the proposed increase in pay already passed by the House, I believe this will be overcome. It does not aid the present condition, however. The ships of the Navy are not in condition to meet any foe in their full strength. Unless they are in such condition as to be able to enter a battle when supplied with a crew of fighting strength our full measure of national protection is reduced.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am extremely interested in a proper policy of economy. I consulted the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee to-day in the presence of Admiral Taylor, and they both told me that unless this appropriation is made now it will have to be made later this year. So where, therefore, does the economy come in? It seems to me that this is a good business proposition. The appropriation ought not to be made next year. It ought to be made now, so these ships can be placed in proper repair. My friend, the distinguished Republican leader from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], a short time ago in the city of Philadelphia made the statement before 400 or 500 of our distinguished citizens that this naval appropriation had to be cut. There was no testimony there at that time. He had not visited the Philadelphia Navy Yard. He had not seen these great battleships tied up there for want of sufficient repairs. When the proper page of this bill is reached the following amendments will be offered to make proper provision.

On page 18, after line 20, insert the following:

Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks: For general maintenance of yards and docks, including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$2,500,000.

On page 20, after line 2, insert the following:

Bureau of Construction and Repair: For preservation and completion of vessels on stocks and in ordinary, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$3,250,000.

On page 20, after line 2, insert the following:

BUREAU OF STEAM ENGINEERING.

Engineering: For repairs, preservation, and renewal of machinery, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$2,500,000.

On page 20, after line 2, insert the following:

Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: For fuel; the removal and transportation of ashes and garbage from ships of war, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$1,050,000. The limitation in expenditures from the appropriation, "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, fiscal year 1920," for pay of classified employees is increased by the sum of \$800,000.

The following communication from the Secretary of the Navy to the Speaker of the House emphasizes the need of these appropriations:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 21, 1920.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The serious situation with reference to the military efficiency of the Navy impels me to write earnestly inviting the attention of Congress to the necessity of the deficiency appropriation of \$10,314,962.19, requested by me in my letter to you of the 18th day of December, 1919, and which passed the House last summer, but which failed of passage in the Senate. The conditions are much more serious now than they were when presented at that time and are set forth fully in the accompanying letters from the chiefs of the Bureaus of Operations, Construction and Repair, Steam Engineering, and Yards and Docks. It will be seen from these letters that unless an appropriation is available, there will be a serious loss of the military efficiency of the Navy. These officers whose letters I am inclosing are charged with the responsibility of keeping the fleet in readiness for any emergency that may occur and their letters show the necessity for this appropriation. I need not say to you that the necessity of discharging 13,900 skilled artisans, whose service to the Navy in the war was one of the important factors of its efficiency, would be a matter of grave concern and that without this appropriation it will be my painful duty to discharge these men because there will be no funds to pay them. I am sure that the Congress, when they read these letters from the naval officers who have given this matter great study, will agree with me that this is a matter of immediate importance and prompt action will be taken.

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

HON. FREDERICK H. GILLETT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington.

From: Chief of Naval Operations.
To: Secretary of the Navy.
Subject: Essential deficiency funds.

1. There are transmitted herewith letters from the chiefs of the Bureaus of Construction and Repair, Steam Engineering, and Yards and Docks, setting forth the urgent need for additional funds with which to carry on the essential maintenance work of the Navy.

2. The present unsettled conditions throughout the world demand that the ships of the Navy be kept in efficient condition for action. The number of ships now capable of operating effectively in case of emergency is dangerously small. This condition is a direct result of a lack of funds with which to prosecute vigorously the required repair work on vessels whose material fitness has been lowered through the excessive and continuous demands of war service.

3. Although every effort has been made to reduce maintenance charges by disposing as rapidly as practicable of the vast accumulation of shipping that it was imperative to incorporate into the Navy to meet the needs of a wholly unprecedented war, it has not been possible to adjust to the money available the work necessary on the remaining vessels required for service, as might have been done in a period of peace. The situation, therefore, which now confronts the Navy, in case additional funds are not made available by February, is a reduction of the number of ships which can be made promptly available for operation to a point which will seriously compromise our national security, and also a marked reduction of the force of civilian employees now at work in our navy yards. An estimate of the number of artisans, mechanics, and other yard employees involved in such a reduction has been made and amounts to 13,900 men.

4. This situation was clearly foreseen, as is indicated by the steps taken last August to secure an extension of the maintenance appropriations. It has now developed to the point where further delay in securing additional funds will affect disastrously both the material efficiency of the fighting forces of the Navy and also, in so doing, the valuable work organizations of thousands of skilled mechanics now employed in our navy yards.

R. E. COONTZ.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR,
Washington, January 3, 1920.

To: The Secretary of the Navy.
Subject: Funds.

1. In connection with the item of \$3,250,000 additional under the appropriation "Construction and repair of vessels, 1920," contained in the estimates forwarded with letter of the Secretary of the Navy dated December 16, 1919, the bureau notes that the allotments made under this appropriation for the months of July and August were based on a table of expenditures for the fiscal year, drawn up to provide for

continuing the work under the appropriation throughout the year without exceeding the amount appropriated—\$31,000,000.

2. It appeared to the department early in the fiscal year that the progress being made with work on vessels of the fleet was not sufficiently rapid to meet the requirements of the military situation, and in letter of the Secretary of the Navy of August 14, 1919, this bureau was instructed to increase its monthly allotments to navy yards so as to permit proceeding with the urgent work on naval vessels as rapidly as practicable without a material increase in the force, it being understood that such increase in the allotments would necessitate incurring a deficiency or making a marked reduction in expenditures in the latter part of the fiscal year.

3. In accordance with these instructions, allotments in excess of the amounts estimated as practicable without exceeding the appropriation have been made, and unless additional funds are provided it will be necessary by about the end of January to reduce greatly the allotments to navy yards if a deficiency is to be avoided. The bureau's estimates indicate that it will be practicable from the funds remaining available at the end of January under the present appropriation to provide during the last five months of the fiscal year for the current charges incidental to the operation of the fleet, the payment of classified force and other charges that are necessary to prevent interruption of new building work, the charges necessary to prevent deterioration of vessels, and a small amount to cover emergency work on vessels of the fleet, but it will be necessary to stop all general overhaul.

4. In connection with the overhaul of vessels of the fleet, it is noted that there is a large accumulation of work resulting from two causes—first, the necessity for the postponing during the continuance of hostilities of work which was not of immediate urgency, and, second, the necessity for undertaking on the more modern vessels of changes the necessity for which was made evident or emphasized by experience gained during the war. While the deterioration and reduction in military efficiency that results from postponing work of this character can be accepted during hostilities when keeping the vessel in condition for immediate service is of vital importance, the undue postponement of work under peace conditions puts the Navy of the United States at a disadvantage as compared with other navies and should be accepted only when the reasons for postponement are extremely urgent.

5. A general statement of the condition of work on the principal types of vessels of the fleet and the progress possible with and without additional funds is given below:

(a) Dreadnoughts: Of the 15 dreadnoughts actually in service the overhaul on 2 has been completed, the overhaul on 2 can be completed and 1 about half completed from the funds now available, the overhaul of 4 has been well advanced and could have been completed from the funds available had it not been found necessary to withdraw them from the navy yards before all work had been accomplished, and no work can be done on the remaining 6. With the additional funds work can proceed on all these vessels that can be made available.

(b) Predreadnoughts: Of the 13 predreadnoughts which it is expected to keep in condition for active service, but without undertaking changes necessary to keep them strictly up to date in a military sense, the work on 3 has been partly advanced, but in general the work has not yet been started, due to concentrating on more modern vessels. With the additional funds it will be practicable to proceed with the overhaul of all these vessels, but without the additional funds work will have to stop.

(c) Armored cruisers: Of the eight armored cruisers which it is expected to keep in condition for active service, the work on one has been completed. Practically nothing has been done on the other seven, and little, if any, work can be undertaken unless additional funds are provided.

(d) Destroyers and destroyer tenders: As it is contemplated to keep only about half of the total number of destroyers in active service with the fleet at any one time, it is the bureau's intention to undertake the changes necessary to improve the military efficiency of these vessels on those not with the fleet, replacing the vessels with the fleet in rotation. With the additional funds the work on a certain number of these vessels could be completed, but unless additional funds are provided no work of this nature can be undertaken. The expenditures for the maintenance of these vessels, owing to the large number, 288, involves a considerable sum, although the expenditure per vessel is small. Owing to the limited number of destroyer tenders available, it is very important that they be kept in efficient condition, and practically no work can be done on these vessels unless additional funds are provided.

(e) Submarines and submarine tenders: The conditions affecting the work on submarines and submarine tenders are in general the same as those affecting the work on destroyers and destroyer tenders.

(f) Fuel and supply ships: Under present conditions and with the number of vessels available, the overhaul of these vessels so as to place them in efficient condition is of great importance. Little work other than routine docking can be undertaken unless additional funds are provided.

(g) Miscellaneous vessels of the train: Two of the hospital ships and 12 of the mine sweepers required for fleet operations should be placed in efficient condition. Rather extensive repairs to mine sweepers are necessitated by the work in connection with the removal of the North Sea barrage. The work on the mine sweepers required for immediate service can be undertaken from the funds now available, but no work can be undertaken on the remaining vessels of this class.

(h) Cruisers, gunboats, and miscellaneous vessels not operating with the fleet: Unless additional funds are provided, no work other than absolutely necessary maintenance work can be undertaken on these vessels.

TAYLOR.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF STEAM ENGINEERING,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1920.

From: Bureau of Steam Engineering.
To: The Secretary of the Navy.
Subject: Deficiency appropriation.

1. At the beginning of the fiscal year a tentative monthly allotment was made of funds for labor at navy yards chargeable to appropriation "Engineering," this allotment providing for a gradual reduction in the force employed, in order to keep expenditures within the appropriation. Following representations of the Chief of Naval Operations as to the necessity for completing as quickly as possible the repairs to capital and other ships either undergoing or awaiting repair, the department on August 14, 1919, directed the bureau to increase its monthly allotments for labor with a view to expediting repairs, but without a material increase in the number of men employed. This con-

tinued until about December 1, 1919, when the provision of \$2,500,000 for the Bureau of Steam Engineering as contained in the deficiency bill was stricken out in the Senate.

2. Up to this time allotments had been made on the basis of an expenditure of \$32,500,000 per annum instead of \$30,000,000, but the failure of the Senate to agree to the deficiency appropriation of \$2,500,000 made necessary a further reduction in allotments to yards for labor which, if continued, would still further delay work on ships under repair by reason of the reduction in the number of employees. Upon presentation of the situation the department, under date of December 4, 1919, authorized the bureau to proceed on the assumption that the original appropriation of \$30,000,000 would be increased by \$2,500,000, and allotments are being made accordingly. If this rate is continued and the deficiency requested is not granted, it will be necessary to make a large reduction in the number of employees paid from this appropriation, as the expenditures for the first half of the year have exceeded the pro rata allotment by \$1,250,000.

3. The necessity for the additional appropriation arises from the fact that Congress appropriated only \$30,000,000 instead of \$35,000,000 requested in the estimates of the bureau, which were very carefully made on the basis of the fleet to be maintained and the general condition of the machinery. Subsequent inspection of the ships by the Board of Inspection and Survey has in almost every case shown the necessity for greater repairs than were contemplated when the estimates were prepared.

4. As a result of the reduced appropriation, it has not been possible to proceed with repairs as expeditiously as it was desired, and thus far only five battleships have been overhauled and returned to service, some without the complete accomplishment of some important fire-control work, the necessity for which had been demonstrated from experience gained during the war.

5. Of the remaining battleships in full commission 14 are now at navy yards, some under repair and others awaiting their turn to be taken up when funds are available.

6. One armored cruiser has been repaired and returned to service, another is under repair, and six others are at navy yards awaiting their turn, the only work in progress on them being that necessary for care and preservation.

7. The condition with respect to cruisers and destroyers is similar to that of the armored cruisers, except that in the case of destroyers it is possible to substitute new ones as personnel becomes available and put those in need of repairs in reserve or out of commission, with the repairs held up indefinitely, a condition which is very undesirable and which leads to further deterioration.

8. Work on destroyer and submarine tenders and on vessels of the train is necessarily subordinated to that on capital ships, but with the large number of destroyers and submarines operating with the fleet it is more than ever necessary that the tenders should be in condition, because their presence assists materially in keeping down the cost of repairs, and estimates for this class of vessels were made with this in view. Unless the tenders are available, the volume of repairs to be done at navy yards is automatically increased.

9. The reduced condition of the enlisted personnel, especially in the artificer branch, has made it necessary to do in navy yards much overhauling and repair work which has heretofore always been done by the ship's mechanics and has served to correspondingly increase the expenditure for repairs.

10. Even if the appropriation requested is granted it will not be possible to complete the repairs now in sight during the fiscal year; much of the work must extend well into the next year and the vessels will be unavailable for that period.

GRIFFIN.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1920.

From: Bureau of Yards and Docks.
To: Secretary of the Navy.
Subject: Deficiency estimates.

1. In connection with the item of \$2,500,000 additional under appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks," in the supplemental estimate of appropriations required by the Navy Department and Naval Establishment for the service of the current fiscal year, submitted to the Speaker of the House December 15, 1919 (H. Doc. 532), the bureau submits for consideration the following statement of facts:

Estimates and appropriation for maintenance, 1920.

Estimated by bureau before signing of armistice.....	\$15,000,000
Estimated by bureau subsequent to signing of armistice.....	12,500,000
Estimated later by bureau (hearings, Dec. 3, 1918).....	10,000,000
Recommended by Secretary Dec. 30, 1918.....	7,500,000
Appropriated by Congress July 11, 1919.....	7,500,000
Deficiency estimate Aug. 23, 1919 (H. Doc. 204, 66th Cong., 1st sess.).....	5,000,000

NOTE.—In H. R. 9205, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, the House passed an item appropriating \$2,500,000, which was stricken out in the Senate. In conference the House receded, and the appropriation was therefore not made.

ALLOTMENTS AND EXPENDITURES.

At the beginning of the fiscal year there were 90 activities for which allotments were required. Upon the theory that some of these would be discontinued during the year, or materially reduced, it was decided to allot approximately 55 per cent of the appropriation for the first half of the year, leaving 45 per cent for allotment during the second half. Accordingly the bureau allotted \$4,198,095.05 (55.9 per cent) for the first six months. These allotments were made in three installments, the first for the month of July, the second for the months of August and September, and the third for the months of October, November, and December.

The bureau received many reports that the allotments made would be insufficient, and requests were made for additional funds. Such requests were in most cases necessarily denied; some of the more urgent, which showed real emergencies, were allowed in part, which brought the allotments up to 55.9 per cent.

Reports of actual expenditures and obligations during the first five months of the year showed that the allotments made by the bureau had been, in many cases, overexpended or overobligated. These reports indicated that expenditures during the first six months would be \$4,598,172.96, as against \$4,198,095.05 allotted. It was expected that \$3,425,000 (45 per cent of the appropriation) would be available for allotment during the second six months, but the overexpenditures during the first six months made it necessary to curtail allotments to \$2,901,827.04 (38.7 per cent). The bureau has allotted \$1,429,500

for the months of January, February, and March, and reserved \$1,472,327.04 for April, May, and June and for emergency allotments during the six months.

REQUIREMENTS OF YARDS AND STATIONS.

For the first six months the yards and stations estimated \$7,040,182.62 and were allotted \$4,198,095.05. For the second six months they estimate \$5,063,442.02, and in addition the Bureau of Navigation asks for \$873,824.32 for naval training stations, under the provision of the current appropriation act making this appropriation available, to supplement the regular naval training-station appropriations. This makes a total of \$12,977,448.96 estimated for the year as against \$7,500,000 now available, or \$10,000,000 if the deficiency appropriation now asked for is granted.

The bureau has received many telegrams and letters setting forth the necessity for more funds under this appropriation, and quotes some expressions therefrom to illustrate the views of the officers in charge of the activities for which the funds are used:

New York: "The public works division will practically cease to function."

Philadelphia: "The amounts requested are very conservative and should not be reduced."

Hampton Roads: "Had the commandant maintained the expenditures within the allotments the cessation of all operations at the naval operating base would have resulted."

Boston: "Earnestly request bureau authorize additional sums requested, which are absolutely essential for proper operation of yard."

Puget Sound: "All work enumerated in above reference is of maintenance character, very urgently needed and necessary to meet the demands of rapid overhaul of Pacific Fleet."

Mare Island: "Yard strongly renews recommendation that monthly allotments be materially increased."

Portsmouth: "This amount is utterly inadequate for the needs of this yard."

GENERAL.

The pay of men on leave and for holidays is an item deserving particular mention. The leave and holiday pay of all workmen carried on yards and docks pay rolls comes out of this appropriation, although the pay of the men for working days may be charged to other appropriations. For instance, if it becomes necessary to put a gang of 50 men on a job for repairs to a building damaged by fire or storm, the pay of the men for working days would be chargeable to appropriation "Repairs and preservation," but the pay for any leave taken by any of these men or for any holiday that might occur would be chargeable to appropriation "Maintenance, yards and docks." It should be borne in mind that the Bureau of Yards and Docks is what might be termed a service bureau; that is to say, it serves the other bureaus of the department with public utility services. If it fails to render prompt and efficient service, the work of the other bureaus is adversely affected. Failure to give prompt transportation service, for instance, in connection with a ship-repair job, and consequently, while the Government is saving more or less by not expending the money on transportation facilities, it is paying out probably more than is saved due to the increased cost of the ship-repair job. This appropriation to a very large extent provides for the expenses which in a large commercial institution would be termed "overhead charges," and in the case of navy yards, as in the case of a commercial establishment, if the overhead is not charged to the fund provided for the purpose, it must be charged to some other funds, so that there is no ultimate saving by not charging it to the proper funds in the first place.

It is a well-known fact that the cost of labor and material has very materially advanced since prewar times. Due allowance for this should be made in comparing prewar appropriations and expenditures with those of this time.

A further consideration must be urged in requesting an increase in "Maintenance" appropriations. This is the immense increase in naval shore property during the war. The property investment has more than doubled. Shore facilities in 1916 were appraised at \$208,894,467. This had increased to \$473,971,595.47 at the end of the last fiscal year.

C. W. PARKS.

I hope that Members of this House will be broad enough in their views and that the chairman of the committee himself will be broad enough in his views to treat this subject in the same fair way in which he treated other items in the earlier part of the bill which were subject to points of order, and agree to increase these items to their full amount.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to some of the observations made by the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. VARE]. I notice in this morning's Philadelphia paper that the gentleman is taken somewhat to task because he was not present at a meeting of the Appropriations Committee when the item about which he has been talking was under consideration, and it was stated that it was lost by one vote, and thereby some 2,000 workmen in Philadelphia would probably be out of work.

Now, this navy-yard item is a propaganda to keep a lot of men at work whether the work is absolutely necessary at this time or not, and they are bringing pressure to bear upon the Appropriations Committee to put this item in the bill, when properly it is a matter of consideration by the Naval Affairs Committee of this House, and I am informed that the Naval Affairs Committee of the House are giving this matter consideration.

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. VARE. I will state to the gentleman that I was here all last week and personally visited the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I was taken sick last Thursday at the Washington Terminal and sent the chairman of the Appropriations Committee an additional telegram, which he will admit he received. I will go further and say that when I received a long-distance phone call notifying me of the meeting last Satur-

day morning I was sick in bed in my home. I dictated an additional telegram from my sick bed last Friday night, which the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has in his files.

I will go further and say that the gentleman should not take too seriously things that the Philadelphia newspapers sometimes print.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman just quoted one here himself.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that gentlemen ought to thrash out Philadelphia politics among themselves and not here on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the committee will rise informally to receive a message from the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. I do not care to suspend to receive a message from the Senate. The messenger can wait until I have finished my five minutes. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the explanation of the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. VARE], because I know that certain matters are under consideration by his committee, and he is usually present.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there is absolutely not a word of truth in the statement in any paper that there would have been any different result if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE] had been present and voted to put this item in the bill. It would have gone out just the same.

Mr. WALSH. Then, Mr. Chairman, apparently the vicious attack made upon the distinguished gentleman from Philadelphia is unwarranted; but nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, this demand for this sort of legislation, which is going to cost the taxpayers \$10,000,000, is nothing but the result of a propaganda. You talk economy here one day, and the next day you are met with propaganda to keep some men at work. Does anyone suppose that these skilled workmen can not find employment elsewhere? I will tell you why they want to find employment in the navy yard. It is because they find work in navy yards much easier than in private employment.

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. VARE. When the gentleman has a leaky roof, does he wait until a rainy day to have it repaired or does he fix it while he has efficient men to do it?

Mr. WALSH. There is no analogy in that whatever. The gentleman would have the committee understand that if these repairs were not done instant, and unless we had a contingent fund of \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000 always on hand in order to do this work, we would lose a lot of money. I submit that is not the case in this instance, and that these men desire to retain these positions for the simple reason that working for the Government in the navy yard is not as hard work as working in private employment. Then we will be met with the demand for increases in pay because these men have to work so hard for Uncle Sam. They never have to work so hard but what they are willing to come in and ask for an additional appropriation of \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000 in order that they may keep their places.

Mr. VARE. The gentleman from Massachusetts was present last year when this bill passed. He presided in the chair. He saw this House pass a similar bill. That being the case, and these ships having lain idle for six or seven months longer, are they not in greater need of repair now than they were then?

Mr. WALSH. I say that takes action of the Naval Affairs Committee. How do we know but what they may say that a lot of these ships will be put out of commission and that they ought to be sold? This committee has no particular knowledge of the facts, notwithstanding the Secretary of the Navy may have urged such an appropriation. Gentlemen from other districts have these navy yards, and it is true of some of my distinguished colleagues that they become very active when this question comes up for consideration, because the men live in their districts. There may some of them live in my district. My district adjoins the waters of Boston Harbor; but I do not intend to submit to dictation in this matter, and I do not intend to vote for millions of dollars out of the pockets of the taxpayers simply to keep men at work at the behest of organized propaganda. Let them find work in other employments. There is abundant opportunity and at higher wages.

Mr. VARE. Relative to the question of my presence at the meeting of the committee I wish to read the following telegrams I sent to the gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the first from Union Station, on January 22, and the second from my home in Philadelphia the following evening:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 22, 1920.

HON. JAMES W. GOOD,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives:

I had to go to Philadelphia to-night. I want to remind you of my intense interest in the naval item of the deficiency bill and thank you for your support.
Wm. S. VARE.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., January 23, 1920.

HON. JAMES W. GOOD,
Chairman Appropriations Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

I am unable to attend meeting of the committee Saturday morning, being confined at my home with severe cold. Since coming to Philadelphia I find there are 150 ships awaiting repair at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. It is surely in the line of economy that these ships be repaired. I trust the committee will allow the full amount requested by the Navy Department in the bill now being reported.

WILLIAM S. VARE.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes on this same question.

Mr. GOOD. I shall be forced to object. When we reach the Navy items it will be time enough to discuss them. We have not reached them yet, and this is all out of order.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman kindly explain why he has allowed the debate to proceed thus far?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE], a member of the committee, explained that he had not spoken on the bill, and the chairman could not object to a member of the committee who had not spoken at all speaking out of order. When we get to the items relating to naval affairs the gentleman can speak. Let us proceed in order.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.
SIGNAL SERVICE OF THE ARMY.

Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system: For defraying the cost of such extensions, betterments, operations, and maintenance of the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system, including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, the sum of \$95,000 is made available from the appropriation for the "Signal Service of the Army," for the fiscal year 1919, to continue available during the fiscal year 1921.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my colleague has reserved a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not hear the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve a point of order. I simply want to ask the chairman a question. How did it happen that you take money away from the Signal Service of the Army to use for this military cable and telegraph system?

Mr. GOOD. This is a request made by the War Department that out of an appropriation, as I recollect, something like \$105,000,000 they be permitted to use \$95,000 of the unexpended balance to lay this cable. The committee called the attention of the officers who appeared before us to the fact that this was not a deficiency and that it might well wait. It was the contention of the War Department that this cable, which is a self-supporting institution, is getting in bad shape and that they ought to be permitted to commence to get the materials at once. There are about 100 miles of cable giving out and showing great weakness, and they say that unless it is replaced they might lose the use of the cable altogether.

Mr. CALDWELL. I understand that, but the question I wanted to ask is whether the money appropriated for the ordinary expenses of the Signal Service of the Army should be used in this case? Have they more than they want for the service, or is it a fact that they will have to cut out something that the Military Committee has seen fit to authorize?

Mr. GOOD. No; they have an unexpended balance of \$25,345,824.57, and the War Department is asking for this.

Mr. CALDWELL. I understand, but when appropriations are made through the Committee on Military Affairs these matters are figured out carefully. We have provided enough money for their activities, and what I wish to know is have we provided a surplus?

Mr. GOOD. I understand they have a sufficient balance to take care of all the anticipated demands that will be made for the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the point of order, of course the gentleman knows that this is a matter taken care of in the military appropriation bill. I would like to ask whether the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs was consulted about this in any way?

Mr. GOOD. I do not think he was.

Mr. MCKENZIE. The gentleman further states that in his judgment it is not a real deficiency.

Mr. GOOD. It is an emergency, and there is no money with which to do the work.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Is it not possible that the Committee on Military Affairs, when it makes its annual appropriation, now

in a few weeks, will make a part of the appropriation immediately available and take care of the matter in that way?

Mr. GOOD. That was my idea in regard to the proposition when it was presented, but the officers were so insistent, saying that they must order their material right away, that it would take approximately a year to get this cable, and insisted very strongly on the appropriation. The committee did not want to take jurisdiction of the subject for the reason that the gentleman from Illinois has expressed. I am not particularly alarmed about it personally, and it may be that some of the officers are more exercised over it than the committee. But it is subject to a point of order, because it changes a designation of an appropriation already made and provides for the expenditure of a part of it in 1921.

Mr. McKENZIE. I think that this very item is a pretty fair argument for a budget system. When these men go to the Committee on Appropriations a few weeks before the military appropriation bill will be reported and get this item put in a deficiency bill without any knowledge on the part of the Committee on Military Affairs if it had not seen the item in this bill, it seems to me is a good argument for the budget system. But, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman says the evidence of a deficiency was not very apparent, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. McKENZIE. My point of order is that it does not represent a deficiency; that there is no deficiency in fact, nor will there be a deficiency existing by the 1st of July.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly apparent that the Committee on Appropriations did not have jurisdiction to make this appropriation for the next fiscal year, as it purports to do here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

For the medical and hospital department, including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, the sum of \$1,500,000 is made available from the appropriation "Medical and Hospital Department" for the fiscal year 1919.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not like this proposition of taking from the appropriation for the Army—

Mr. GOOD. Let me say to the gentleman that my recollection is that we appropriated for this year the sum of \$4,500,000 for medical service in the Army, and three million and a little over has been expended. It will take \$3,000,000 to take care of the sick soldiers and supply the medical treatment for them, and they have a balance of only about \$1,500,000 in this appropriation.

Mr. CALDWELL. I understand, but you are taking the appropriation out of what you might need for another year.

Mr. GOOD. For the preceding year. There is a large unexpended balance of the appropriation for the medical service.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS.

For one-half cost of purchasing the bridge across the Missouri River at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., \$17,500: *Provided*, That this sum shall not be available for expenditure until local authorities shall have paid over to the Secretary of War a like amount to complete the purchase of said bridge and shall have agreed to reimburse the United States for one-half of the cost of repairing and maintaining the same: *Provided further*, That the ownership of the bridge shall be and remain in the United States, but the public shall have free use thereof for purposes of transit under such regulations as the Secretary of War shall prescribe.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the item.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is new legislation and is not a deficiency and is unauthorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Texas make the point of order against the item. It is clearly legislation. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANTHONY: Page 16, line 5, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"For bridge across the Missouri River connecting the two tracts of land composing the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., \$35,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is new legislation, is not authorized by law, and is not germane to the bill or to the preceding paragraph or to any paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Kansas on the point of order.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Chair I would state that the Government took possession of the bridge in question during the war under the authority of legislation enacted by Congress authorizing it to take property for the purposes of the prosecution of the war. It formally and duly took over the bridge in question. The question that has been before the War Department has been the determination of the proper price for the bridge. The Secretary of War and the representatives of the owners of the bridge have reached an agreement on the subject, and the Secretary of War has accepted a contract of \$35,000 for the bridge in order to settle the claim of the owners against the Government for taking over the bridge. The amendment that I offer is to appropriate the money to complete the payment under the contract made.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman cite the Chair to legislation authorizing this?

Mr. ANTHONY. The general legislation enacted by Congress authorizing the War Department to take over property necessary for the prosecution of the war, under which the War Department took over the bridge in question.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been a previous appropriation for this purpose?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; but the Government has expended some \$7,000 since they took possession of the bridge in putting in a new floor.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Was the seizure of this bridge under the provisions of the Hay bill or under some other statute?

Mr. ANTHONY. Under the general war powers conferred by Congress on the War Department.

Mr. CALDWELL. If it was seized under the provisions of the Hay bill, in order that the seizure might be effective it was necessary that an appraisal be made and that three-quarters of the price be paid.

Mr. ANTHONY. Steps were taken through the formal channels authorized by law and notice was posted by the United States marshal for the district that the Government had taken over the property.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unable to find any specific legislation authorizing the purchase of a bridge across the Missouri River or the building of a bridge across the Missouri River. If there is any authority for it, it must be under the general powers of the Government during the war.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me call the Chair's attention to the fact that this is a proposition for the Government of the United States to go into partnership with certain people in Kansas to build a bridge partly at their expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is before the Chair and does not require explanation. The provision is for a bridge across the Missouri River. It does not state specifically whether it is to be bought or built, or whether the Government is to go into partnership with anyone. The provision is a bald one, for a bridge across the Missouri River. The Chair, being unable to find any specific authority for it, is not willing to so construe the amendment as to indicate that the general war powers conferred upon the War Department were such as to authorize this committee to appropriate on this bill for a bridge of this kind for which no previous appropriation has been made.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does not the Chair take cognizance of legislation which was passed conferring those war powers on the War Department under which the department had acted?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unwilling by his ruling to hold that the action of the War Department in taking over a bridge, whatever that may mean, thereby placed this committee in a position to appropriate money on a deficiency bill to pay for it in face of a point of order. With such authority as has been laid before the Chairman and such as he is able to find, he is unable to hold the amendment in order. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

The Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, is authorized to expend from the unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made under the title "Armament of fortifications" for the construction of storage facilities, including necessary appurtenances, for ammunition and components thereof for cannon, small arms, machine guns, and trench warfare, and for other ordnance matériel, not exceeding \$6,600,000, which amount shall remain available during the fiscal year 1921: *Provided*, That the Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, is hereby authorized to expend such part, not exceeding \$95,000, of the amount herein authorized as may be necessary for the purchase of land in the vicinity of Ogden, Utah, to be used as a site for an ammunition storage depot: *Provided further*, That the construction work hereunder shall be done by contract, let to the lowest responsible bidder, and no bid shall be accepted for any building to cost in excess of \$2.45 per square foot for an unlined building or \$2.90 for a lined building.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. I want to ask the chairman a question. Why should Congress

in a deficiency bill provide an appropriation of \$6,600,000 that could be made available through the year 1921? Has not Congress through its more appropriate committee during the year 1921 plenty of time to make this provision if it becomes necessary?

Mr. GOOD. If this item is carried and the appropriation made, it will be necessary to carry on the work largely in 1921, and the only reason it was undertaken here was because of the very urgent request of the War Department, especially the Ordnance Bureau, that its storage ammunition magazines should be constructed so as to remove the ammunition now on hand to places where, if there should be an explosion, it would not cause the loss of life and property that it will cause if left where it is now stored and there is an explosion.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman think it a wise idea for Congress in a law to fix a maximum limit of \$2.45 per square foot for an unlined building and \$2.90 per square foot for a lined building when the gentleman knows that whenever we fix the maximum amount that may be spent that immediately becomes the amount that is spent.

Mr. GOOD. I think that is true, but I think when the gentleman learns just what the facts are he will see the wisdom of doing that very thing. As I recall, the amount estimated for the unlined building was \$4.50 a square foot. They said that is what it would cost. We went into the question to ascertain what magazines of this kind which were built during the war cost under the cost-plus system. We found that during the war similar magazines were built under the expensive cost-plus system at an average cost of \$2.45 for unlined buildings and \$2.90 for lined buildings.

Now they say that to get these buildings it will be necessary to pay a great deal in excess of this; and it was the opinion of the committee that if these magazines were to be constructed now certainly they should not be constructed at a cost in excess of the maximum cost under the cost-plus system, and that is why we put on the limitation; and by putting on the limitation we reduced the appropriation by \$1,000,000.

Mr. BLANTON. But suppose in the year 1921 the Republican steering committee of the House and the Republicans of the Senate cease to spend all of their time on bills regulating the height of buildings in Washington and begin to consider the height of the cost of living, and are possibly able to reduce the price per square foot below \$2.45 for an unlined building and below the price of \$2.90 for a lined building, then would the gentleman want us to get the benefit of that and not want us to have to pay that, because we are going to have to pay the very price we put into this law as a maximum, and the gentleman knows that?

Mr. GOOD. Having suggested to the gentleman that in some parts of the country he was a close second for Mr. Bryan for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, I did not know he was going to come right back and concede the Republicans would have the control both of the House and Senate in 1921. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLANTON. It will be the greatest calamity that ever happened to the American people. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is new legislation, is unauthorized by law, and not a deficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to withhold the point of order or the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. The Chair has sustained it.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think we can gain anything by discussing it. I think we ought to go on with the bill.

Mr. WELLING. I want to be heard on the proposition for a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order, but the gentleman must address himself to the point of order. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. BLANTON. I will not object to the gentleman talking out of order, but I make the point of order.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the Chair will hold that this is new legislation. The very first sentence of this paragraph provides that "the Chief of Ordnance is authorized to expend from the unexpended balance of appropriations heretofore made under the title 'Armament of fortifications.'"

Mr. BLANTON. How much of this is to be spent in Utah?

Mr. WELLING. Oh, my friend, that does not make any difference how much is to be spent in Utah. I am talking about the merits of the point of order that has been urged against this provision.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman direct his attention to the proviso in this section?

Mr. WELLING. Well, the proviso is probably subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. That makes the whole paragraph subject to the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman is directing attention to the entire paragraph. The entire paragraph unquestionably ought to be stricken from the bill.

Mr. WELLING. I want to appeal to my friend to let me have 5 or 10 minutes, under a reservation of his point of order, to explain this provision.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the gentleman from Utah on any proposition, but the gentleman will recognize that if one single word of this paragraph is subject to the point of order it makes the whole paragraph subject to the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah be permitted to address the House for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears none.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph in the bill provides for the proper storage of \$474,875,000 worth of ammunition that has been provided during the war. During the war period we shipped this ammunition to the arsenals which were located along the Atlantic seaboard: the Raritan Arsenal, which is near Port Amboy, N. J.; Delaware Ordnance Depot, between Wilmington and Philadelphia, in New Jersey; the Curtis Bay General Ordnance Depot, which is near Baltimore; Big Point General Ordnance Depot, near Norfolk; and the Charleston General Ordnance Depot, near Charleston, S. C. As we prepared the ammunition that was used in the war, all of which was to go overseas, it was forwarded to these depots in shipload lots. It is now located there, and I want to invite the attention of the gentleman from Texas to the fact that it is stored there in such large quantities as to imperil life and property. The people who live near those arsenals to-day are protesting against the large amount of explosives that are located there contrary to the law in every State where it is located. Now, the War Department is going to be obliged, unless this provision for these new arsenals is made, to remove this material to temporary storage quarters at a cost to the department that will exceed the amount that is asked for in this appropriation bill. It is clearly in evidence here in the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations that the Government has been asked to provide for facilities for storing these heavy explosives in places that will be safe for the people who live there.

Now, I want to say in justice to the people who live in my State that no human being from that State has ever appeared before that committee or anybody else and asked for an appropriation that goes to Ogden, Utah. The engineers of the War Department decided this matter themselves. The Ogden depot was selected because it was the proper location for one of these arsenals without any regard to local sentiment. I submit that the purchase of land for the arsenal at Ogden is clearly, under the rulings of the Chair for days past, subject to the point of order, but I want to appeal to the gentleman from Texas to withdraw the point of order and to permit these arsenals to be built, because if they are not built where they belong it will cost the Government of the United States much more to provide temporary storage for this material than is being asked for in this paragraph.

Ogden city is the most important railroad center in the intermountain country. It is within 24 hours of Portland and Seattle in the Northwest by direct rail route. It is but 800 miles from San Francisco, just west of us. It is on the main line to San Pedro and Los Angeles in the Southwest, and from it we can effectively reach in 24 hours our Mexican border or the Pacific coast. There is ample justification for the action of the Army engineers in this case, and any obstacle to the movement is the poorest sort of economy.

If the item goes out of the bill to-day under the House rules, it can be safely predicted that it will be again inserted before the bill becomes a law.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELLING. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman believe that in the course of orderly procedure and passing sane legislation there should be some limitation to the kind of appropriations and legislation put into an urgent deficiency bill that come out on the floor of the House?

Mr. WELLING. The gentleman assumes that everything that does not agree with his own particular notion is insane legislation. The Appropriations Committee has prepared this measure, and I assume they knew as much about what ought to have gone into the provisions of the bill as the gentleman from Texas or anybody else. It is an appropriation that is needed now, for the reason that if these arsenals are not begun as soon

as work can be started next spring they will not by any possibility be completed in time to take care of the ammunition before the end of 1920. It is now being stored in violation of the State laws where these ordnance depots are located on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. BLANTON. And yet the gentleman who guides the destinies of this committee now holds it is unlawful to go into this bill.

Mr. WELLING. I believe it is subject to a point of order, but I do not believe just because it is subject to a point of order we ought to delay a needed improvement which the War Department engineers have found to be urgent at this particular time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already sustained the point of order, and there is no reason to change the ruling. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval Records of the Rebellion: Not exceeding \$15,500 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the continuation for the fiscal years 1913 and 1914 of the publication of an edition of 11,000 copies of the official records of the Union and Confederate Navies, in the War of the Rebellion, which were continued and made available until June 30, 1918, by the act approved September 8, 1916, are further continued and made available until June 30, 1921.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that paragraph be passed for just a few moments until the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] returns. He has gone to the telephone. He is interested in the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the paragraph will be passed over.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval Establishment—Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. It comes on line 20, and so I think it had best be offered at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TINKHAM: Page 18, after line 20, insert the following: "Maintenance, Bureau Yards and Docks: For general maintenance of yards and docks, including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$2,500,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order for the purpose of asking a question. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] how he supposes that certain labor organizations in inland States—1,800 miles from Washington—could know anything about this amendment he is going to offer, so that Members of Congress sitting here in their seats within the last few hours get not one telegram but several, not requesting but telling them to vote for this particular \$9,000,000 that the gentleman wants, part of which is to be spent in Philadelphia? How do you expect they find these things out?

Mr. TINKHAM. Five months ago the Secretary of the Navy sent recommendations to the Appropriations Committee concerning these very items. Five months ago these items were considered by that committee. Four months ago the first deficiency bill was reported and contained these very items, and was passed by this House and these items were debated. The items were defeated in the Senate. Then, when the second deficiency bill came up, the Secretary of the Navy sent recommendations for these items again to the Committee on Appropriations. The subcommittee on deficiencies again gave hearings on them. Then, the subcommittee on deficiencies refusing to report the items, the Secretary of the Navy transmitted, on the day after the subcommittee had refused, a communication containing the recommendations from four of the bureaus, from the admirals in charge, recommending these appropriations or items as absolutely necessary for the national defense.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman does not answer my question.

Mr. TINKHAM. Wait a moment. And those recommendations were published in nearly all of the newspapers of the United States. That is the way the knowledge has come not only to the people but to the Members of this Congress who are at all familiar with the operations of Congress during the last five months or are familiar with the official records.

Mr. BLANTON. For instance, how would people down in, say, Oklahoma or Kansas know that this amendment was coming up to-day?

Mr. TINKHAM. Because it was in all of the newspapers of the country that these items were necessary for the national defense. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that it is new legislation, not germane, and that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on that point of order.

Mr. TINKHAM. May I ask the honorable Representative from Texas to reserve his point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order it is not germane to the subject matter.

Mr. TINKHAM. May I ask the honorable Representative from Texas to reserve his point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] requested to be heard on the matter.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If the gentleman contends this amendment is not in order, I want to be heard on it.

Mr. TINKHAM. Does the honorable Representative from Texas reserve the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. The regular order was demanded, and therefore I made the point of order. Otherwise, I would have reserved it.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order made against his amendment.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, what has been the point of order that has been made by the honorable Representative from Texas?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had better direct what he has to say to the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] also. The gentleman from Illinois made a point of order.

Mr. TINKHAM. Will the Chair state what the point of order was?

The CHAIRMAN. That the amendment was not germane.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be again reported.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering whether the Chair was anticipating whether some one would make the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] made the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. I made the point of order that it was not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] asks unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. TINKHAM. Now, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Massachusetts as to the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Before the gentleman speaks on that, I make the further point of order that it is not germane to the preceding paragraph of the bill which it follows.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, is that the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas as to the germaneness?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] made the point of order as to germaneness. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, the question of germaneness is merely a question of relativity, and the question of relativity depends on the keenness and logicity of the mind of the man that is determining it.

Now, it is with great interest that I note on page 2220 of the RECORD, in a decision by the Chair in relation to an item in this bill, that the Chair said:

It is clear to the Chair that an estimate having been brought in by a department of the Government, the estimate having been considered by the Appropriations Committee, and it having been found by that committee to be necessary to add to the appropriations heretofore made an additional sum to carry on the activities of this particular department to the end of the present fiscal year, it was properly included in this bill as a deficiency item.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order properly to rule on the question of germaneness raised, the actual facts in relation to this item should be distinctly and clearly understood by the Chair. It is this: That this item is the very item that has been recommended by the Navy Department of the Government to the Committee on Appropriations as a deficiency item. That is item No. 1.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman contend that because it is within the province of the committee considering the recommendation of the head of a department to incorporate it in its recommendation that it is also proper for a Member on the floor to offer it after the committee refuses to include it in its bill?

Mr. TINKHAM. My answer to the honorable Representative from Illinois is that if the Navy Department in a deficiency bill is given a deficiency appropriation and then there is a subtitle covering a bureau of that department which is given an appropriation, then an amendment under that subtitle, if it is not germane, limits the rights of the House to only increase or decrease the actual amount reported for the particular subject designated and curtails the rights and liberties of the House as it has never been before curtailed by any decision. As I understand it, for 50 years—take for example a river and harbor bill—there has been a right where a bill contained an appropriation for several rivers to add an item for another river. And if the Chair should rule that it is not germane for me to offer the amendment which I have offered when the title had been reported by the Committee on Appropriations and then under that title a deficiency had been reported for a bureau within the department, that no amendment could be made except to increase or decrease the appropriation recommended, then practically all right of amendment is taken away from the House and the right of amendment is reduced to the smallest and most circumscribed limits.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. TINKHAM. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman fails to grasp the fact that the river and harbor bill is not a general appropriation bill, and that the rule applying to amendments offered to a general appropriation bill do not apply to a river and harbor bill.

Mr. TINKHAM. In reply to the honorable Representative from Illinois I would say that, in the first place, amendments to appropriation bills are usually allowed, and there is no decision that I know which subtracts from the liberality of germaneness in relation to them. In fact germaneness in relation to appropriation bills has always been interpreted as more liberal than the question of germaneness in relation to legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. What I do maintain is that the rule applicable to the river and harbor bill is not applicable to any general appropriation bill, and I think the gentleman himself would be compelled to concede that.

Mr. ELSTON. Can the gentleman state what the difference is?

Mr. MADDEN. One is a general appropriation bill, to which the rule refers, and the other is a legislative bill where the committee preparing it has the power to make appropriations.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I will.

Mr. CRISP. I will answer the inquiry propounded to the gentleman from Massachusetts by my friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the question being, Has the Committee on Appropriations more power to insert a deficiency item in this deficiency bill than the Committee of the Whole or the Whole House on the state of the Union? I answer very clearly, according to my opinion, that the Committee on Appropriations has no more authority than the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. [Applause.] In other words, the standing committees of the House are simply creatures of the whole House, and certainly the creature has no more authority than the creator; and if the Committee on Appropriations has the right to include a deficiency item in a general deficiency bill, then undoubtedly the whole House has that same right. And if the Committee on Appropriations has authority to include in the bill a certain item, then, in my judgment, it is in order for any Member of the House to offer such amendment, for the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union certainly has as much power as the Committee on Appropriations.

I want to say, so far as I am concerned, that I recognize no difference in the rules of the House in the consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill and any other appropriation bill. The river and harbor appropriation bill is one of the regular appropriation bills, the same as any other.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I know the gentleman from Georgia is an authority on parliamentary law, one of the greatest in this House.

Mr. CRISP. I thank the gentleman. He is my partial friend.

Mr. WALSH. But he is mistaken in regard to the river and harbor bill. Under the rule it has been decided that it is not one of the general appropriation bills.

Mr. CRISP. I am not aware of that decision; and if that is the decision, I am in error.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask another question of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. TINKHAM. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Is the gentleman from Georgia willing to admit that in the consideration of an item the Committee of the House is entitled to take into consideration the statement of a head of a department which submits an estimate to the effect that the estimate is not a deficiency?

Mr. CRISP. Answering the gentleman about that, I have given the matter no thought. I endeavored to answer the direct inquiry propounded to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] by my friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. Now, this being a general deficiency bill, and including a number of items that are deficiencies for the Navy Department, the Post Office Department, and various other departments of the Government, I do think it would be in order to offer an amendment providing for a deficiency in some other branch of the different services when you are considering the bill dealing with deficiencies for the Navy Department. In my judgment the crux of this whole matter is whether or not the amendment is a deficiency.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman were sure that it were not a deficiency, then his argument would not apply?

Mr. CRISP. I am not prepared to say it is a deficiency. That is a question of fact, but undoubtedly if the matter is not a deficiency it would not be in order even if proposed by the Committee on Appropriations or by a member of this committee here in this House on a deficiency bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to straighten out this thing about the river and harbor bill. No rule of the House ever made a river and harbor bill an appropriation bill, but by long practice it has become one of the appropriation bills, and the Speakers have applied to the river and harbor bill the same rules that are applied to appropriation bills, as a matter of practice and not as a matter of rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the former Speaker of the House be kind enough to yield to me?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I think I may say with a good deal of safety that during the long period of the distinguished service of the gentleman as Speaker of the House he frequently ruled that the same points of order that could be made against an item in a general appropriation bill would not apply if made against an item in the river and harbor bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The trouble about that is that the Speaker of the House never presides in the Committee of the Whole in the consideration of one of these appropriation bills. When I was Speaker, somebody else always presided in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Crisp] has very correctly stated the situation, in my judgment, with respect to the right of the Committee of the Whole to make, by amendment to the pending bill, any deficiency appropriation that the committee might have made, but failed to make. I do not wish to misquote the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], but I understood him to claim that there is one rule as to germaneness in reference to appropriation bills, and another and different rule for river and harbor bills, general claims bills, and public building bills. Does the gentleman make that contention? I understood him to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the rule of germaneness applicable to appropriation bills did not apply to bills of a different character.

Mr. MADDEN. The statutory rule which makes a river and harbor bill distinct in itself is the rule to which I had reference. It may not be incorporated into the rules of the House.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I understand perfectly well that the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee and the jurisdiction of the other committees are separate and distinct. That distinction is made by the rules; but there is no distinction in parliamentary law between the rule of germaneness as applied to an appropriation bill and the same rule applied to other bills, with one exception, which is made by the rules, and that is revenue bills. As stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Crisp], the rule for all of these bills is precisely the same, save only that there is a special rule of germaneness provided by our rules for the consideration of revenue bills.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman will find, I think, that it has been held that the river and harbor bill is not one of the general appropriation bills, and is not subject to their restrictions as to legislation.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The question of legislation is not involved in this discussion.

Mr. WALSH. That goes to the question of germaneness.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Not necessarily.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman referred to the special statute that takes care of certain features of a river and harbor bill when the question of jurisdiction is raised.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. But that has nothing to do with the general principles of germaneness.

Mr. WINGO. That statute was with reference to jurisdiction.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have not raised any question under the general head of legislation on an appropriation bill. To do so would call for a totally different line of precedents, and would lead the discussion away from the matter under consideration. I maintain that the rule of germaneness as found in the Manual, applies alike to appropriation bills and to general bills of a different character.

It was stated by the Chairman in a ruling recently made that it was not in order to introduce a different subject matter by amendment. This is the exact language of the rule but this language does not carry the meaning attributed to it, either by the Chairman, or the gentlemen who contend that the pending amendment is not in order. This language does not mean that when a proposition is carried in a bill, another proposition directly related to the matter under consideration, is a different subject matter, and therefore not in order as an amendment. To so hold would be to hold out of order 90 per cent of the amendments that have been held to be germane.

The rule of germaneness so construed would have a very limited application. In the very case cited by the Chairman some minutes since, if he will turn to the opinion he will find that the Chair had in mind a proposition that was not akin to the subject under consideration, was not related to it save in the most remote degree, and was therefore a different subject matter. I recall that precedent perfectly well. The bill under consideration was a deficiency appropriation bill, and the amendment offered from the floor proposed to repeal the law which made the superintendent of public printing an appointive officer. This amendment was in no wise germane to an appropriation bill. There was no kinship whatever between the matter proposed by the amendment and the subject matter before the committee. The facts of that case very clearly show what the Chairman had in mind and what Mr. Speaker Carlisle had in mind and what the rule has in mind, by the words "a different subject matter." Every amendment in a sense is a different subject matter, since if it was already in the bill there would be no occasion for an amendment. The words "different subject matter," as used by the rule, mean another proposition not related to or akin to the subject matter of the bill; therefore, a totally different subject matter. The rule of germaneness deals with propositions different from those contained in the bill, but sufficiently akin to be admitted as amendments. The Chair must determine the degree of kinship or relationship. If the thing proposed is remotely akin, then it will not be in order. The content of the amendment may be an entirely different subject matter by name, but so akin to the subject matter under consideration as to be within the law relating to germaneness, and therefore in order. May I take an illustration from a precedent that is often cited? A bill is under consideration to admit the territories of Virginia and Kentucky to statehood. It is entirely in order to add Maryland, another territory, by way of amendment to that bill. Yet there is nothing in the bill about Maryland. The name of Maryland nowhere appears. On the face of the bill it deals exclusively and by name with Virginia and Kentucky.

Apply the principle insisted upon in this discussion, namely, that a different subject matter can not be added to a bill by amendment, and the amendment proposing Maryland would not be in order. If the Chairman interprets correctly the words "a different subject," then the Chairman, who, in the case cited, admitted Maryland as a germane amendment, and all the presiding officers who have adopted and followed that ruling were in error. Yet the veriest tyro in this body knows that in the case supposed, which is cited in the manual as a leading case, the inclusion of the third Territory was held to be in order. What is the principle upon which that precedent rests, a precedent apparently in conflict with the ruling of Speaker Carlisle. The subject matter as to content was the Territories of Virginia and Kentucky. The amendment proposed a different subject matter, the Territory "Maryland" not referred to or contained in the bill. Plainly you would say out of order under the ruling cited by the Chairman, yet that amendment was admitted, and the ruling has been cited and followed a hundred times. The principle is very plain. The subject matter of the bill, the purpose of the bill, was the admission of Territories. The amendment proposing another Territory for admission was plainly akin to the main purpose of the bill. Hence it was germane to this general purpose, and therefore in order. No one questions the propriety of that ruling. It is firmly estab-

lished as a ruling case. But if the case cited was pending to-day for decision, the same objection that is now made to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts could be made with far greater propriety to the amendment proposing the addition of Maryland to the Territories included by name in the bill. There is a much more apparent kinship between the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the bill which he seeks to amend than there was between the bill and the amendment in the precedent cited.

I will add a few illustrations derived from the practice of the House in the consideration of the general claims bill, the general rivers and harbors bill, and the general public building bill. Suppose this present contention is correct, this interpretation of the rule well taken, what will happen when these bills are under consideration? Bear in mind that this is an assault upon the power of the House and the Committee of the Whole. It is a limitation of their authority, compelling them to consider only the matters brought in eo nomine by the committee, and excluding all additions of other matter by amendment, however closely that matter may be related or akin to the matter reported by the committee.

First as to the general rivers and harbors bill. Under the present contention no additional river and harbor project could be added to the bill, because it would be a different matter, inasmuch as the committee had declined to include it in the bill. Yet in the past these additions have been constantly made by amendment. Many years ago a river and harbor bill was before the committee. An amendment was offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] providing for three dams on the headwaters of the Missouri River to impound those headwaters, and thereby promote navigation by increasing uniformity of flow in the river. There was nothing of this character in the bill. It was a different subject matter. Mr. Burton, of Ohio, a very able parliamentarian, insisted that the amendment was not germane, but he was overruled.

Mr. Burton, who had charge of the bill, made the very point of order now made to the Tinkham amendment, namely, that it was not germane. He insisted that his bill had nothing to do with dams, that he was not undertaking to impound waters for any purpose, and that the amendment therefore was foreign to the bill. Yet that amendment was held in order, and the ruling placed upon the very obvious considerations that the bill related, in large part, to the improvement of navigability in the rivers, and the amendment of Mr. MONDELL, whether wise or unwise, in fact had an evident kinship, or relationship on its face to the subject of the bill. Hence under the rule it was germane. (Hinds', Vol. V, sec. 5803.) To a bill generally providing for rivers and harbors an amendment providing an additional harbor is germane. (Hinds', Vol. IV, sec. 4120.)

Mr. TINKHAM. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. TINKHAM. Was not this the decision on that point of order? The Chairman said:

The Chair thinks that this amendment is germane to the subject matter of the bill and the subject matter over which the Rivers and Harbors Committee has jurisdiction.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Absolutely. That is the proposition I now maintain, and under no other contention could the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming have been held in order.

I will take an illustration from the public building bill. It is competent for the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to report a bill including many public buildings. Suppose they appropriate for public buildings for 50 cities, and leave out, say, the cities of Chicago and New York. The committee, for reasons sufficient to itself, chooses to make no appropriations for buildings in those cities. In the bill, we will say, in section 1 is Richmond, in section 2 Philadelphia, in section 3 Savannah, and so on.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman contend that it is within the power of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee to make appropriations?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Oh, no; authorizations. I thought the gentleman had a real question to ask. [Laughter.] As suggested, suppose the committee had left Chicago out of the bill and had made authorizations for the other cities, what would be the attitude of the gentleman from Chicago in respect to offering an amendment to provide for Chicago? Would he hold that such an amendment would be out of order? The question answers itself. He would move to include the city of Chicago. Would that amendment be in order? Plainly. A bill for a number of public buildings can be amended by adding another. (Hinds' Precedents, Vol. V, p. 429, bottom of page, and p.

430, top of page; see also Vol. V, sec. 5840.) But that amendment would not be in order under the present contention. Chicago would be a different subject matter from any contained in the bill. Hence in that view neither Chicago nor any other city could be added to the collection of cities the committee chose to include in its bill. Such amendments, however, have always been held in order, in spite of Speaker Carlisle's ruling, on the ground that they were germane to the subject matter in and purpose of the bill, and hence were not different subject matters in the sense contemplated by that eminent parliamentarian.

Take the general claims bill, that conceivably might include 10,000 claims. The committee reports a general bill, but includes only 50 claimants by name. Amendments adding other claimants would in each case, in a sense, introduce new subject matters to the cases included in the bill. Would these amendments be in order? Not if the present contention is sound. Yet such amendments have always been held to be in order. (Hinds' Precedents, Vol. V, p. 429, bottom of page, and p. 430, top of page, sec. 5840.)

Any claim that the committee might have included in the bill can be added by amendment. The fact that the committee does not report a claim does not deprive the House or the Committee of the Whole from adding that claim to the bill. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Crisp] says, the hand can not be bigger than the body. The committee by failure to include a proper claim in a bill can not keep the committee from adding it by amendment.

The illustrations, Mr. Chairman, that I have given all show that a different subject matter can be added to a bill if it belongs to the general jurisdiction of the committee and might have been reported by the committee. It must therefore be apparent that the true meaning of the words "different subject matter" is a totally different subject matter, not related to or akin to the subject matter of the bill. If the amendment falls under this head, or the kinship is too remote, it will not be in order. Speaker Reed, discussing question of germaneness, said:

It is impossible to lay down any precise rule on this subject and much depends on the good sense of the presiding officer.

In that connection, he quoted the rule that no motion or proposition different from the subject under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

Yet this same Speaker Reed, when a bill was before the House relating to Federal elections and the functions of Federal courts, admitted an amendment establishing a system of jury commissioners. (Hinds' Vol. V, sec. 5922.) There was nothing in the election bill about jury commissioners. Hence it would seem that an amendment providing them was a different subject matter. But on the principle of germaneness the amendment was admitted.

Take the situation which confronts us to-day. The Chair has held that this is a general deficiency bill in the broadest sense in which it is possible to rule to that effect. This is a deficiency bill in the sense that it not only deals with actual deficiencies created either by action of the departments in excess of their authority in expending more than had been appropriated, or by action of the departments exercising the discretion given to them to contract under exigent conditions further than the amount actually appropriated for would allow them to go.

The Chair has held further that although no actual deficiency has been created, yet where it has been shown by a department that a public work which has been appropriated for can not be completed by that appropriation by reason of the expanding cost of labor, or of material, and more money is required to carry out the project, then that is a deficiency.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman contend that it is within the power of the head of any department of the Government of the United States to create a condition beyond the amount of the appropriation that has been set apart for the conduct of his department by the establishment of new enterprises or the development of new projects?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That has been already ruled on.

Mr. MADDEN. And that would be called a deficiency?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If that contention is good, then there is no limit to the power of the departments.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have been contending somewhat to that effect heretofore. I do not undertake to say, mark you, that the executive department can make us appropriate for a project, but if it thinks that the project is in the public interest and ought to be expanded in the public interest, and an

additional appropriation is needed to expand it, then, as I understand the rulings heretofore made, this supplementary appropriation is a deficiency, and can be included in a deficiency bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Regardless of whether it is a deficiency in fact, but merely a deficiency in the mind of the department, it must be appropriated for in a deficiency bill, according to the gentleman's contention?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the bulk of the items in this bill are not deficiencies in fact. A member of the committee tells me that none of them is. This committee is clothed with the authority of appropriating under the conditions cited for all the matters that have been defined as deficiencies in the very broadest sense. This section deals with the Naval Establishment, the Bureau of Yards and Docks. The amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts is for the maintenance of yards and docks, \$2,000,000, or whatever the sum may be. In the contention over this point of order I would like for some one to undertake to say that this amendment is not related to the subject matter of the bill and is not related to the particular subject matter now under consideration, namely, yards and docks.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman maintain that the maintenance of yards and docks includes the employment of men to make guns and machinery of all kinds?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No; not at all.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what this appropriation is sought to be made for.

Mr. TINKHAM. Not at all.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will leave the gentleman from Massachusetts to defend his amendment against that charge.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. The manufacture of guns in the Navy does not come under the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am not contending that it does.

Mr. HICKS. I said that in answer to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am contending that with respect to the maintenance of yards and docks a deficiency exists for which the committee could have included an appropriation. The amendment is relevant and germane. I contend that the committee on deficiencies could have made this appropriation, and if they could have made it, that the amendment can be offered to this portion of the bill.

I have taken some time in this discussion, Mr. Chairman, because the subject of germaneness is an exceedingly important one. The rights of this House in this connection are exceedingly important. The effect of this point of order, if it be sustained, would be to exclude a very large percentage of the amendments that will be offered in this body.

I will give the Chair a more recent illustration. A few days ago a river and harbor bill was before the Committee of the Whole. The committee reported a lump-sum appropriation. An amendment was offered for some specific projects which were not provided for eo nomine in the bill. There was no reference in the bill to the Mississippi, or the Missouri. Doubtless the Committee on Rivers and Harbors sought to report the bill in a form to exclude, if they could, under the rules the amendments that they knew would be offered. All of the arguments made to-day against this particular amendment were made against the Denison amendment. The river and harbor bill made a lump-sum appropriation, while the amendment proposed to appropriate for development of certain specific objects, not exclusively for maintenance. When the amendment was offered the point of order was made that it was not germane. It was overruled, I think, by the gentleman now occupying the chair.

Later it was renewed in a more amplified form before the Speaker of this body, Mr. GILLET. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] offered a motion to recommit, and affording practically a general river and harbor bill with a multiplicity of items not included in the committee bill. The same point of order now raised was raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the same objection in respect to germaneness was urged, namely, that the bill related to one subject matter, and the amendment introduced a different subject matter.

The Speaker very properly rules that there was that sufficient kinship, or relationship, between the matter in the motion to recommit and that in the original bill to make the same in order. He so ruled, and a vote was taken on the merits of the amendment proposed. Mr. Chairman, for the reasons that I have given in extenso, I submit that this amendment is in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to the fact that he does not seem to be in line with the decision of Mr. Speaker Carlisle, to which the present presiding Chairman referred this morning, when the gentleman from Georgia says that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union has every bit of the authority that the deficiency appropriation committee has in bringing a bill before the House. Now, the decision of Mr. Speaker Carlisle is that the deficiency appropriation committee can put various and sundry items into a deficiency bill that have no relevancy to each other, and yet when that bill comes before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, even though it has in it various and sundry items with no relevancy to each other, yet no Member from the floor, not even a member of the committee having charge of the bill, can offer any amendment not germane and introducing a new subject.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield.

Mr. CRISP. I have the very highest respect and the greatest admiration for Mr. Speaker Carlisle. He was one of the great Speakers of this House, a great parliamentarian, and I do not arrogate to myself anything like the ability or knowledge of parliamentary law, or on any other question, which he possessed, but I never can subscribe to the doctrine that one committee of this House—21 members; in fact, 12 members, a majority of the committee—has more power than the other 423; neither can I ever subscribe to the doctrine that the creature has more power than the creator. Now, I know there is a theory, and I know there is a tendency, to try to prevent anything coming up on this floor that has not been considered by a committee, for, you say, you might have ill-advised legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. Was the gentleman from Georgia present when the very efficient chairman gave the reason of Mr. Speaker Carlisle?

Mr. CRISP. I was not.

Mr. BLANTON. He gave this reason, and I would like the gentleman to have the benefit of it: When a committee reports out a deficiency bill the Members of Congress know what is in that bill, and if they do their duty they prepare themselves to meet and either defend or oppose every item in that bill. They are put on notice as to what is coming up; they are not required to anticipate that either the committee or some other Member of Congress will bring in an entirely new subject or entirely irrelevant matter for them to consider and take them by surprise. That was a very good reason which Mr. Speaker Carlisle gave and which the Chair adopted as a ruling, and I take it the gentleman from Georgia will agree with me that the gentleman who now occupies the chair is one of the best parliamentarians in the House, except when it comes to counting the Members to make a quorum; his arithmetic is bad then sometimes; but as to his being a good parliamentarian, he is one. Now, to end the matter, in view of the fact that I want this matter to come out of the bill, I want this amendment kept out of the bill—in view of the fact the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has made a good point of order which is going to force the amendment to come out, I would rather that it came out so far as I am concerned on a Republican point of order than on a Democratic point of order, so I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CRISP. May I ask the indulgence of the gentleman to complete the statement which I was making?

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield the floor to the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up the time of the committee only to the extent of completing the answer which I was making to the gentleman from Texas. I think it is a reason why the House might reject an amendment that has not been considered by the committee, but I still assert, in my humble opinion, that one of the standing committees of the House has no greater power than the House collectively, except in one instance, and one only, and that is under the last clause of the Holman rule, and the committee only have greater power there because the rules of the House expressly say so, and the rule must be strictly construed and not enlarged. Under the last clause of section 2 of rule 21—the Holman rule—there is a provision that legislation is in order on an appropriation bill if the legislation is germane and will reduce expenditures, provided it is recommended by a committee of the House or by a joint committee or by the House members of a joint committee. Now, the committee having jurisdiction of the legislative subject matter might propose legislation that will retrench the expenditures which would be in order, where if the amendment were offered on the floor by an individual Member it would not

be in order. That is so simply because the rule expressly says so. But, saving that one proposition, I do not believe that a committee has greater power than the House itself.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, and Mr. MANN of Illinois rose.

Mr. CRISP. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Just for a second. Does not the gentleman at least lose sight of the fact that the Committee on Appropriations is appointed by the House. We are not in the House here. This is another committee of the House, and the doctrine that the creator has greater power than the creature really has not very much to do with the fact that we are in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, which is as much a creature of the House as the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CRISP. Answering the gentleman from Illinois, I think the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, which consists of 435 Members, has more power—

Mr. BLANTON. Sixty Members, usually.

Mr. CRISP (continuing). And is superior to the Committee on Appropriations, just as the House itself is superior to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I will.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Does the gentleman agree with me that this matter turns on the meaning of the words "a subject different from that under consideration"?

Mr. CRISP. You mean germaneness?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes; germaneness.

One of the decisions that was cited by the Chairman this morning in another ruling is found in Fifth Hinds', section 5825. A deficiency bill was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole and an amendment was offered to repeal the law making the Superintendent of Public Printing an appointive officer. Upon that state of facts the Chairman ruled that an amendment bringing in a totally different subject matter, one not related to the subject under consideration, was not in order. The amendment plainly was not related to the subject under consideration, and obviously presented a different subject matter. The Chair therefore correctly ruled that it was not in order. He could not have ruled otherwise.

Mr. CRISP. No.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. A former Speaker of this body, Mr. Reed, in his booklet on parliamentary law, quotes the rule relating to bringing in different matter by amendment. This provision has been retained in our House Rules for a long time, and in no wise changes the rule of germaneness. This rule is as follows:

No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

Yet the same authority who cited this rule, when presiding in the House during the consideration of a bill relating to Federal elections and the functions of Federal courts, admitted an amendment providing for jury commissioners, a matter that was not in the bill. According to the contentions that some of our friends are making, did not that amendment present a different subject matter?

Mr. CRISP. It did.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. And yet under the rule of germaneness Mr. Speaker Reed held it to be in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] spent a greater portion of his time on the question of germaneness, and he made an argument with reference to germaneness which in all its aspects, I admit, would apply to a general appropriation bill of the House. Now, in order that an item should be germane to a deficiency bill it must come within the requirements of the rule as to germaneness relating to general appropriation bills or any other subject matter. His reference to the river and harbor bill, I submit, is not analogous to this case, because in treating the river and harbor bill in the Committee of the Whole it is considered as a legislative proposition and not as one of the general appropriation bills of the House. The point of order having been made that the item provided for in an amendment is not a deficiency, in my judgment makes it incumbent for somebody upon the committee to assure the Chair that the item of appropriation provided for a deficiency in the appropriation heretofore made for that particular class of work. Now, if we can provide for these various departments of the Government in deficiency bills, there certainly is no necessity for having the regular general appropriation bills passed for the various branches of the Government. This matter was brought before the Committee on Appropriations at the last session, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy appeared before the committee, and the chairman of the Appropriations

Committee on opening the hearing on September 10, 1919, made this statement:

Mr. Secretary, the committee had concluded its hearings when we received your letter of to-day with regard to this estimate of \$18,600,000 for the Naval Establishment, the items being \$5,000,000 for the Bureau of Yards and Docks, \$2,000,000 for the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, \$6,500,000 for the Bureau of Construction and Repair, \$5,000,000 for the Bureau of Steam Engineering. Officers of the Navy Department have appeared before the committee and have explained in detail the situation and the necessity for this appropriation. If I understand the situation correctly, there is no deficiency?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And your present program, unless additional funds are granted by Congress, has so regulated the work of the yards that there will be no deficiency?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The estimate is made on the theory, I take it, that if the money were granted you would then make your allotments so as to employ more men to repair more of the vessels of the Navy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We would try to complete the repairs on the war vessels this year instead of having them drag over two years.

It seems, Mr. Chairman, unless the proponent of the amendment can show that the conditions are materially changed and that this is an actual deficiency in the appropriation made for the purposes to which the amendment refers, which was carried in the general naval appropriation bill for the year 1920, it is not proper.

Mr. DUPRÉ. What is the date of the hearing the gentleman read from?

Mr. WALSH. September 10, 1919.

It is not proper to add this to a general deficiency bill.

Mr. TINKHAM. Will the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to my honorable colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. TINKHAM. Does he know that the Chair ruled day before yesterday that an anticipatory deficit of this character was in order in a deficiency bill and in this bill?

Mr. WALSH. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that I did not know that, and I do not think the gentleman can point to the Record and show where the Chair made any ruling upon an anticipatory deficit. The gentleman is mixing deficits and deficiencies, I think, in his consideration of the matter.

Now, this is for the same purposes as those which are carried in the general appropriation bill, which covers a multitude of items under the head of "Bureau of Yards and Docks," and it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that to bring in this amendment under cover of a claim for deficiency, unless it can be clearly shown that a deficiency exists, or that obligations have been incurred which have created a deficiency which would exist prior to July 1, this year, it can not actually be made on this bill. If it is for the purpose of instituting new work, or for the purpose, as some of the telegrams say, to keep a lot of men at work [applause], then that is not an actual deficiency such as is contemplated by the rule.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the honorable Representative allow me to read the decision of the Chair?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. TINKHAM. I will say to my honorable colleague from Massachusetts that on pages 2219 and 2220 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on January 29, the Chair ruled as follows:

The act cited by the gentleman from Massachusetts and explained with clearness by the gentleman from Virginia does not, as it seems to the Chair, enter into the consideration of this point of order. The act referred to was passed for the purpose of controlling heads of departments in the disbursement of appropriations, and not to affect in any way the rules of the House or the proceedings of the House in making appropriations. Therefore the Chair does not feel called upon to construe the act.

The point of order made by the gentleman from Massachusetts is that the paragraph in question does not present a deficiency. He distinguishes between a deficiency and an anticipatory or anticipated deficiency. The Chair is not able, however, to follow this line of argument to any satisfactory conclusion, being unable to distinguish between a deficiency and an anticipated deficiency or an anticipatory deficiency. If the paragraph does not present a deficiency in the parliamentary sense of the word as used in this House, it has no place in the bill.

It has been shown that this appropriation sought to be made in this paragraph is authorized by existing law. It is also shown that it was appropriated for in a previous act, now current law. The question now is whether the present paragraph is a deficiency item appropriate to be included in a deficiency bill.

A deficiency, as used in this House, as was so ably explained by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT], means a deficiency in an appropriation heretofore made. In the practice of the House deficiency bills have always carried the items for the expense of carrying on the different departments of the Government for the time intervening before the end of the current fiscal year. It has been the practice in the House that each appropriating committee, other than the Committee on Appropriations, shall bring out one appropriation bill each fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee brings out the sundry civil bill, one District appropriation bill, one fortifications bill, one legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, one pension appropriation bill, and such number of deficiency bills as may be necessary to take care of the deficiencies arising from lack of sufficient appropriations in all the other bills for carrying on the various activities of the Government to the end of the fiscal year.

It is clear to the Chair that an estimate having been brought in by a department of the Government, the estimate having been considered by the Appropriations Committee, and it having been found by that committee to be necessary to add to the appropriations heretofore made an additional sum to carry on the activities of this particular department to the end of the present fiscal year, it was properly included in this bill as a deficiency item. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. TINKHAM. I will.

Mr. ELSTON. What "gentleman from Massachusetts" is referred to in the quotation just mentioned?

Mr. TINKHAM. The same gentleman that the honorable Representative from California is now questioning.

Mr. ELSTON. The one I am looking at or the one I am pointing at?

Mr. TINKHAM. The one you are pointing at now.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished colleague now point out where the Chair has made any ruling upon an anticipatory deficit?

Mr. TINKHAM. In reply I would state that he has ruled that any money necessary to carry on the department in accordance with the recommendations of that department can be met by an item in a deficiency bill. The Navy Department came before the subcommittee on deficiencies of the Committee on Appropriations and said that the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other bureaus could not for the rest of the fiscal year do the work that was necessary and absolutely essential unless certain sums were provided. The amendment which I have offered is in conformity with their request and is to meet those necessary appropriations for expenditure until the first of the next fiscal year.

In accordance with the ruling of the Chairman, it is plainly competent; and if it is not competent in a deficiency bill, then it will be admitted by those who have heard the various items read in this deficiency bill that practically 5 per cent of the items are not competent, because they are to meet expenses to be incurred in the future, although they are recommended by the several departments.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question to his colleague?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] desire to be heard further?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I simply wanted to direct a question to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts who has the floor [Mr. TINKHAM]. It is this: The opinion of the Chair, to which the gentleman has just called the attention of the committee, had reference to an item in the deficiency bill, reported by the Committee on Appropriations, and to which the gentleman from Massachusetts raised a point of order. Of course, the case at issue now is not at all on the same basis as the question in connection with which the gentleman read the ruling of the Chairman.

Mr. TINKHAM. The honorable Representative from Illinois is entirely mistaken. The point of order was raised in relation to the Council of National Defense and in relation to an item which provided for the pay of certain employees and the extension of their work for the balance of the year. The appropriation now before the committee for yards and docks is for the pay of men and the extension of work, namely, repair work in the Navy Department. They are absolutely of a piece, identical, and one and the same, so far as purpose and policy are concerned.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, on January 5, 1920, when the Assistant Secretary was again before the Committee on Appropriations, he was asked by the chairman if there had been any change in the situation which had developed since they conducted their hearings on September 10, 1919, relative to these estimates for yards and docks, supplies and accounts, construction and repair, and steam engineering, and the Secretary said he thought he could stand absolutely on what he said before. So that the situation, from the point of view of repairs, is just as serious as it was then. The committee was interested in the lay off of men that would be entailed if they did not get it.

Now, I submit that it is incumbent upon the committee or the gentleman from Massachusetts, who offers the amendment, to adduce some facts showing that this is an actual deficiency in the sum which was appropriated in the general appropriation bill for these specific objects.

Mr. DEWALT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I could add anything to the information of the Chair, because my remarks are addressed entirely to him, as he is the party who

rules on the question, as to the question of germaneness, nor possibly could I enlighten the Chair at all as to the question of whether or not this is a deficiency. But in order to determine the question, Mr. Chairman, we must first find, or attempt to find, what is being done.

Now, what is being done or attempted to be done? First, we have a deficiency bill which includes on this page the item of a naval establishment and a subitem thereunder of "Bureau of Yards and Docks." Now, bear in mind that the line subsequent to the line at which this amendment is proposed contains these words, to which I call specific attention:

The limitation specified in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920 on expenditures for pay of classified employees from the appropriation "Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks," is increased by the sum of \$400,000.

Now, let us bear in mind, first, that here is a specific provision, naming the sum of \$400,000 for the maintenance of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and it provides that the limitation specified in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year of 1920 on expenditures for pay of classified employees is increased by this sum of \$400,000.

Now, the very next thing that we desire to do, it seems to me, is to inquire what this amendment is. What is the amendment as proposed? It is entitled—

Maintenance Bureau of Yards and Docks—

And it says—

for general maintenance of yards and docks—

The very subject mentioned in this bill—
including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920—

Referring again to the same act which is referred to in the body of this bill to which this amendment is proposed to be made. Now, what follows? That this shall be an appropriation of \$2,500,000. Here it is named at \$400,000. It shall be increased by \$400,000. Now, what is increased by \$400,000? By referring to the act, which is mentioned not only in the amendment but in the act itself, in the deficiency bill, we find that the maintenance of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in that act provides certain things for general maintenance of yards and docks, including not exceeding four naval barracks abroad, and so forth. And then it says:

For incidental labor at navy yards.

Now, conceding, if the Chairman pleases, for the sake of the argument, that this is for labor at these yards, I still say that it is germane to this bill, because it specifies in the bill itself that there shall be an additional enlargement of this appropriation, to wit, \$1,500,000, by \$400,000 more, and this provides for incidental labor at the navy yards. Therefore they both treat of the same subject, to wit, the maintenance of the yards and docks in the Navy Department, and more specifically they treat of labor in those yards. Now, whether that labor be for the repair of ships or whether it be for the maintenance of docks or for other work to be done there, certainly it is included by the very wording of the act itself.

Now, I think that in itself, in addition to what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] has said, is conclusive proof of the fact that it is germane.

The next question is, Is there a deficiency? The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has said that it is incumbent upon the proponent of this amendment to show that there is a deficiency. This Chairman has not ruled that to be necessary. He has ruled that when the department has said that it has a project on foot and that an appropriation has been made, and that in the course of events it is determined by the department that the present appropriation is not sufficient in amount, the deficiency bill can carry another amount enlarging that appropriation. That is the effect of the present Chairman's ruling, made a few days ago. Therefore, if that ruling is correct and if the Chairman desires to be consistent with that ruling, then it follows that there being an appropriation of \$400,000 for the Bureau of Yards and Docks, an increase of \$400,000 over the amount specified in the naval act of 1920, which specifies that it shall be \$1,500,000, this is simply an increasing of that amount more than \$400,000, and it becomes not only germane, but if the department thinks it necessary for the enlargement of the project it becomes a deficiency.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I ask the Chair to bear with me for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from South Carolina briefly.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] stated that the proponent of the amendment must show that there was a deficiency; and in order to show that there was not a deficiency,

he read from the statement of Assistant Secretary Roosevelt. In that statement the chairman of the committee, in the hearings on page 1 of last September, asked:

If I understand the situation correctly, there is no deficiency?

That question is often asked by members of the Appropriations Committee of representatives of the departments who seek deficiency appropriations, for the reason that we seek to prevent them from incurring obligations in violation of the statute. Now, if the gentleman from Massachusetts had read further, on the very next page the question was asked:

It is accumulated work in the way of repairs that you want to do this year?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes; and unforeseen work which we did not know about last spring, at the time of the hearings before the Naval Affairs Committee.

Clearly showing that unforeseen work which could not have been anticipated, in the repairs of ships of the Navy, arose and demanded the expenditure of funds greater than the original allotment, thereby incurring a deficiency in the only way it can be incurred, as the Chair very properly said two days ago.

Now, since that time the hearings will show, on page 324—

Mr. DUPRÉ. What is the date of the second hearing?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Only a few days ago.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The hearing was on January 5.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The statement was by Admiral Parks in response to a question of the chairman:

That was an expenditure for the whole year?

Admiral PARKS. No; that will be required from now on.

This is in reference to an additional item in this bill referring to training stations, which gave to the department the right to draw on this fund to the extent of \$800,000, which they propose to do, and thereby reduce this fund and increase the deficiency for yards and docks. Now, let me read to the chairman what was said by Mr. Roosevelt again:

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It means that during the last six months they must cut down. They only have now 40 per cent of the entire appropriation, and the question came up a week ago, just before the first of the year, as to whether they should cut immediately, on January 1, or divide the remaining 40 per cent of the money that was left by six.

Admiral Coontz, on page 325, shows that they had left on December 1 only \$3,321,000 out of a total appropriation of \$7,500,000. Admiral Parks stated that unless this fund was given to them they would have to cut down the work because unforeseen repairs necessitated the expenditure of so large a part of the money.

The chairman very properly said two days ago, "It is clear to the Chair that an estimate having been brought in by the department of the Government, an estimate that has been considered by the committee to have been found by it necessary to add to the appropriation heretofore, made an additional sum to carry on the activities of this particular department, that it was properly included in this sum." So the only way that the Chair can sustain the contention of those who argue in favor of sustaining the point of order is to say that the Committee on Appropriations has a greater power than an individual Member in this House.

Now, if the Post Office had an actual deficit in the work authorized by law and they came before the Appropriations Committee, and by a vote of one the committee determined not to include it, would the Chair hold that a Member of this House in the Committee of the Whole could not offer an amendment providing for a deficiency of that kind in an appropriation bill? If this is an appropriation bill providing for deficiencies in the various appropriation bills as set forth by the Chair two days ago, any Member of this House has the right to offer an amendment providing for taking care of a deficiency in any department of the Government, and to rule otherwise is to make the Appropriations Committee a czar over the membership in this House; and this is true of every other committee that ever undertakes to exercise the power and deny it to other Members of the House. I hope the Chair will not make any such ruling, for the future welfare of this House.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that in a deficiency bill we could make an appropriation for completing or enlarging or continuing the enlargement of a public building?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; if there was a deficiency in an appropriation authorized by law and the amount estimated did not exceed the limit of cost, I know of no reason why you could not.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to discuss the point of order and have made no preparation to discuss it, but as the discussion has gone on it has occurred to me that there are certain phases of the question before the House that have not been presented.

The Chair held, in effect, as I understand it, that it was difficult for him to differentiate between a deficiency and an anticipatory deficiency. One can readily understand the difficulty of the Chair in that regard. I would be similarly confused; but if the Chair will allow me, this is not a question between a deficiency and an anticipated deficiency, or an anticipatory deficiency, it is a question whether this is a deficiency at all. I am inclined to think an anticipatory deficiency, or an anticipated deficiency, may be provided for on a deficiency bill. We frequently provide for deficiencies that have not actually occurred.

The question is, What is a deficiency? If the Congress provided a certain sum of money for the operation of the navy yards of the country and in making this appropriation made provision with regard to the number of men to be employed during the season, or the number of ships to be repaired, or the units of work the yards should perform, and it developed during the year that with the appropriation made it would not be possible to employ that number of men or repair those ships or to perform these units of work, the department would be justified in coming before the Appropriations Committee before there was an actual deficiency and in the anticipation of a real deficiency that was in sight ask for a sum needed, and the committee would be justified in granting it as a deficiency.

But it must be a deficiency and not a mere request on the part of a department to be allowed to spend more money and do more work, hire more men, or perform more units of work than were contemplated at the time the appropriation was made.

Mr. TINKHAM. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. TINKHAM. Is the gentleman aware that nearly all the items that have been passed in this bill are of the character which he states should not be carried in a deficiency bill?

Mr. MONDELL. I am not willing to agree to that at all. I am taking in a way the gentleman's view that there may be such a thing as an anticipatory deficiency. There are such in this bill, but they are deficiencies nevertheless, deficiencies that are certain to occur with the running of time, with the performance of those acts, the doing of that work, the performance of these duties that the Congress directed should be done.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. As I understand the gentleman's view, if it required the employment of additional people to do additional work, he would not regard it as a deficiency; but assuming that, as in this case, even though this amount was granted, that the department will have to reduce the number of employees, and yet the department could not repair its ships, then the gentleman would regard that as a deficiency, would he not?

Mr. MONDELL. Not at all.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Why does the gentleman make the distinction as to the employment of additional operations?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, let us assume that a million dollars is appropriated for a navy yard, and that means the employment through the 12 months of the year of 1,000 men, but that there are 2,000 men employed. It is plain to anyone that there must be a reduction some time or the intent and purposes of the Congress could not be met, because while the Congress expected to spend a certain amount of money at that point the Congress did not feel under any obligation to employ a given number of men. If it had, it would have so stated. It would have said, "You must employ so many men at a given rate," and then if there was not sufficient money appropriated there would be a deficiency.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman misunderstood me. What I intended to tell the gentleman was that if this appropriation were granted the representatives of the department said it would not mean the employment of additional men, but that, in any event, with this appropriation that there would be a reduction of men.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman will allow me to make a statement, applying it exactly to the situation referred to. If the Congress, as it did in this case, appropriated a certain sum of money for the navy yards, and a sum of money which would not keep employed for the year all of the men employed on the work for which the appropriation was made, it is perfectly patent that Congress intended that the force be reduced. If the Congress had not intended that the force be reduced it would have appropriated more money, in view of the fact that it would take more money to keep all of the men who were employed at the time the appropriation took effect employed for the entire year.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up the time of the committee unnecessarily.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Take this situation: The Congress appropriates for a department money with which to do certain work, which it did in this particular instance. Before the year expires, by reason of an advance in the cost of that work, the particular work can not be done within the appropriation, and the department comes to the Congress and tells it so.

Mr. MONDELL. There is a deficiency.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is this situation exactly.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Does the gentleman know the evidence is that it costs them two and a half times as much and that that is why they are here?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Here is a member of the committee who affirms that statement.

Mr. MONDELL. Not at all. I wish the gentleman from South Carolina would stick to his original line of argument. He argued just a moment ago that what they desired to do here was to do work that they had not anticipated doing, and he read from a statement that was made that they found there were ships that needed repairs that they had not intended to repair.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman would do me an injustice.

Mr. MONDELL. I am doing the gentleman no injustice.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I read the statement of Secretary Roosevelt, but I did not say, it is true, that the hearings show, as they do, through Admiral Taylor and Admiral Parks, that the cost of repairing ships to-day is two and a half times as great as it was when this amount of money was asked for. They gave other reasons, and I did not mean, by failing to state all the reasons given for the deficiency, to exclude them.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, nothing of that kind was presented.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Does the gentleman say it was not presented in the hearings?

Mr. MONDELL. I can not yield. The gentleman may make his argument if he desires to present it, and the Chair will listen to him. That is not the situation. No gentleman has made that argument, and it would not be conclusive if it were made, although that is one of the factors that have to do with the question of a deficiency, but it is only one of the factors. It is not a controlling factor by any manner of means. The Secretary was asked directly whether it was a deficiency and he said it was not a deficiency in his opinion, and it is not.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. What did the Congress do in this case? Congress appropriated a certain sum of money for this work in the navy yards, and when that money was appropriated it was apparent to everybody that it would be impossible to employ all the men then employed in all the navy yards the entire year for that sum of money and keep them busy. Gentlemen here who are now pleading for more money, if they felt it their duty to keep all these men employed, should have asked for an increased appropriation at that time.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. That was the time to secure an appropriation sufficiently large to keep the war force of the navy yards going in time of peace. Of course, gentlemen know perfectly well that if they had made that statement before the House and had endeavored to increase the appropriation on that argument they would not have gotten anywhere [applause], because the House would not have agreed that we must keep the war force at work continuously in time of peace.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Let me finish the line of argument I was upon.

Mr. DUPRÉ. All right.

Mr. MONDELL. What did the Congress do? It appropriated a certain sum of money. It knew perfectly well at the time it appropriated the money it was not going to be sufficient to keep all the men in the navy yards busy the entire year. That is patent to everyone who is familiar with the facts. Further, the Congress must have known that that sum of money would not repair all the ships in the Navy that might have been injured or put out of commission during the war. No one made any argument in favor of an appropriation that would unquestionably repair all the ships. Congress appropriated a certain

amount of money for that purpose, with the expectation that it would go as far as it would. [Applause.] And it would do just as much as could be done with that amount of money and no deficiency is created.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. When the Secretary comes before the House and says, "We have found that there are some ships that we did not have in mind, that we had not thought about, that we would like to have repaired in these navy yards—"

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MONDELL. It does not change the situation because the gentlemen living in the vicinity of navy yards, and anxious to help us reduce the expenditures in the other lines, are insisting that these navy yards shall be continued in full force at the highest price, no matter what economy is practiced elsewhere. [Applause.]

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the point of order.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Is it not a fact that during last September Secretary Roosevelt is quoted in these hearings as having said that there was no deficiency, and this selfsame Appropriation Committee brought in here a deficiency appropriation of \$10,000,000, and it only failed because of a conflict between the Senate and the House?

Mr. MONDELL. They were misled at that time by the Navy Department; they have learned better since then.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Briefly.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I only want to set myself straight—

Mr. MONDELL. I can not yield; the House is becoming impatient.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I simply want to say—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. But he yielded to me.

Mr. MONDELL. This is not a question of an anticipatory deficiency or an anticipated deficiency. It is not a deficiency at all. It is a request for an additional sum of money for a purpose for which Congress has already appropriated, and it is simply an effort to increase the general appropriation for this purpose under the guise of a deficiency. It does not belong on this bill. [Cries of "Rule!"]

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TINKHAM. I desire to discuss the question of germaneness. [Cries of "Rule!"]

Mr. Chairman, I have certain authorities which I desire to submit to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly in closing.

Mr. TINKHAM. I desire to bring to the attention of the Chair a reference to Hinds', 5910:

On January 31, 1899, the bill (H. R. 11022) for the reorganization of the Army was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and Mr. William P. Hepburn, of Iowa, offered as a new section or paragraph prescribing frequent target practice by enlisted men and providing for the giving of medals for the best records.

Hon. James Hay, of Virginia, made the point of order that the amendment was not germane to the bill.

After debate Chairman Sereno E. Payne, of New York, overruled the point of order.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if in a bill reorganizing the Army it is germane to offer a new section prescribing frequent target practice, then, after listening to the honorable Representative from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT], showing that the purpose of my amendment is for the exact purposes as covered by the item now contained under yards and docks, it seems to me absolutely impossible for the Chairman to rule that it is not germane.

Now, I want to bring to the attention of the Chair another example from Hinds', 5912:

On January 27, 1903, the House as in Committee of the Whole was considering a bill (S. 2387) to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States, when Choice B. Randall, of Texas, offered the following amendment:

"That it shall be unlawful for any of the judges of the United States court to accept or receive any gifts, free transportation, or frank from any corporation or person engaged in operating any railroad, steamboat line, express, or telegraph company. Any violation of this provision shall be punished by a fine not less than \$100 and not exceeding \$5,000."

Hon. John J. Jenkins, of Wisconsin, made the point of order that the amendment was not germane.

After debate, the Speaker, David B. Henderson, of Iowa, said:

"This question is one that troubles the Chair a little, but when we consider that this bill deals not only with the salaries but also with the subject of expenses, the issuing of passes, franks, and other things that keep down the expenses would seem to be germane. At all events, the Chair will overrule the point of order and admit the amendment of the gentleman from Texas."

Now, Mr. Chairman, in closing I, of course, admit that it is a question of relativity absolutely when the question of germaneness of an amendment is raised, but on the particular amendment under discussion I want to draw to the attention of the Chair that the question he is to decide is a most important question on which there are no precedents of exact application, and that his decision involves vitally the rights and liberties of this House. I adjure him to make no narrow decision and to give no contracted construction to a matter of this importance. For by his decision he may bind this House by restraining bonds which gravely imperils its right of action and decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] offers to amend, on page 18, after line 20, by inserting the following:

Maintenance Bureau of Yards and Docks: For general maintenance of yards and docks, including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1920, \$2,500,000.

To this the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] makes the point of order that it is not germane, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] makes the point of order that it is not a deficiency.

First, taking up the question of deficiency, it appears that the Secretary of the Treasury, under date of December 18, 1919, transmitted supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the Navy Department and Naval Establishment for the service of the current fiscal year. In this estimate is an item as follows:

Bureau of Yards and Docks: For general maintenance of yards and docks.

Then follows the exact words of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]. The total amount asked to be appropriated under this item of the estimates was \$2,500,000. The amount appropriated under this item in the last Navy appropriation bill was \$7,500,000.

It is urged that at a hearing on this bill the Assistant Secretary of the Navy admitted that it was not a deficiency. The Chair has examined the hearings in this regard carefully, as he has examined the estimates and as he has examined the section of the bill in connection with which this amendment is offered. It is not an easy matter for the Chair to determine what is a deficiency, but from such examination as the present occupant of the chair has been able to give the subject, he is constrained to hold that in the parliamentary sense of the term "deficiency" this is a proper item to be brought in on a deficiency bill, and in order as an amendment, provided that it be germane.

Turning next to the question of germaneness, the Chair heard with interest the argument of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] and of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], two of the ablest parliamentarians in the House and whose opinions the Chair regards very highly. On this occasion, however, the Chair is unable to follow these gentlemen to the logical conclusion of their argument. It seems to the Chair that if he should follow their reasoning in his ruling it might become a very dangerous precedent for the House to follow. It would enable any Member of the House at any time when a deficiency appropriation bill is pending to arise and offer an amendment for an appropriation for any conceivable activity of the Government authorized by law. If it could be shown that a deficiency exists, it would be in order, according to the reasoning of the gentlemen, and would force consideration of a new subject without its having been referred to a committee, without its having been considered by a committee, and without the House having any notice whatever in advance of the consideration of such an item. The Chair is unwilling to follow the judgment of the gentlemen to that extent. The Chair is willing, rather, to follow the precedent set by Mr. Carlisle, when he made the ruling referred to in an earlier ruling to-day, to the effect that the committee having proper jurisdiction of a matter does have a right to bring in matters that no Member from the floor would have a right to bring in as an amendment.

The question here is whether this particular amendment is germane to this bill. In the naval appropriation bill, now current law, under the heading of "Bureau of Yards and Docks," appears the item "Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks," and then follows language embodying the same substance as the language contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]. To that paragraph was appended a proviso, which the Chair will read:

Provided, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, inspection, drafting, messenger, and other classified work in the navy yards and naval stations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed \$1,500,000.

The Committee on Appropriations has reported in this bill a paragraph for the purpose of changing this limitation, increasing it by \$400,000, which means that out of an appropriation of \$7,500,000 made in the current naval appropriation bill, instead of \$4,500,000 being used for the purposes indicated in the limitation, under this bill \$1,900,000 may be used. One reason given by the Chair in the ruling which has been referred to several times to-day was that the House should not be taken by surprise, and that in all reasonable ways the membership of the House should be put on notice as to what business is to be transacted.

The Chair still adheres to that ruling. The Chair, after hearing all the able arguments made to-day, still believes that his ruling, made on that occasion, was sound, and he intends to adhere to it in this ruling. So far as that portion of the former ruling has a bearing upon the present point of order, the question is whether this amendment could properly be said to take the House by surprise. What is the amendment? It is proposed to insert in this bill the substance of the very language of the paragraph which is now in the law and to which the very limitation in which this bill seeks to make a change is attached as a proviso. It seems to the Chair that this committee having inserted in this bill a limitation to a paragraph in the current law which makes an appropriation, and having sought to change that limitation, which would change the amount of the appropriation therein made that may be used for certain purposes, surely there can be no question as to the germaneness of an amendment which is not only related to but which embodies the substance of the original appropriating paragraph. There could be no question of surprise. If anyone has read the limitation in the current law, which it is sought to change in this bill, he has surely read the paragraph in the law to which it is a limitation and that paragraph is the substance of the proposed amendment. Surely it can not be contended that it is not germane when it is sought to insert as an amendment the language to which the limitation now in the bill for the purpose of being modified is a proviso of limitation in the current law. Therefore, believing that this amendment is germane to the provisions already in the bill and that it does not introduce a subject different from that under consideration in the bill, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, may I propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. There is no way that I know of whereby anyone can appeal from any particular part of the decision of the Chair, but I would like to make this parliamentary inquiry: In the opinion of the Chair is it within the province of the Chair to decide whether an amendment offered by a Member from the floor is a surprise or not? And if it is not a surprise he will permit a Member of the House to offer an amendment, but if the Chair decides that such an amendment is a surprise to the House he will rule against the offering of such an amendment? Is that the effect of your decision just rendered?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that in the case of an amendment which is germane to anything in the bill and which does not contemplate the introduction of a new subject under color of an amendment, the Chair will hold it to be in order.

Mr. CRISP. The Chair stated that it had first to be considered by the House committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think he made any such statement.

Mr. CRISP. I think, if the Chair will look at his notes he will find he did.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would not want to make such a statement. That is one of the things that might influence the Chair.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. It being marketing day, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman withhold that?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I simply desire to get an agreement as to the debate. Then I shall move that the committee rise.

Mr. BLANTON. I will withhold, but I would like the chairman to include me for five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. I want to see if we can agree with regard to the time that will be allotted for the debate on this amendment.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I want five minutes, and one of my colleagues wants five minutes.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have at least an hour and a half. It is a very important matter.

Mr. GOOD. I assume that there are going to be four other amendments to be offered in regard to this?

Mr. TINKHAM. Three.

Mr. GOOD. Three other amendments. They are of the same character, so far as the general discussion is concerned.

Mr. TINKHAM. That is correct.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that the time on the whole subject be confined to one hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, let me interrupt the gentleman from Iowa simply to ask him if every Member on this floor who is interested in navy yards has not the right to offer an amendment appropriating money in some degree for this very identical purpose; and, if that is so, whether that would take a considerable time?

Mr. GOOD. I was going to make this unanimous-consent request, that the time for debate on this whole subject be limited to one hour, the gentleman from South Carolina to control 40 minutes in favor of the amendments, and I will control 20 minutes opposed to it.

Mr. BLANTON and Mr. MILLER objected.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the entire time to be given to the discussion be limited to an hour and a half, to be equally divided between those for the amendments and those opposed; that the gentleman from South Carolina shall control the time in favor of the amendments and that I shall control the time for those opposed to the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. CALDWELL. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. WALSH. I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER. I object.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important question, a question that, I think, a great many of the Members, especially those that have employees in yards in their districts, are interested in. It involves about \$9,300,000. I think there ought to be a limited time for debate. Personally, I shall oppose the amendments, and I do now oppose them. I do not think that these amendments ought to carry, and therefore I move that all time for debate on the amendments be limited to 1 hour and 30 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to withdraw his motion. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. We can not reach any agreement, and there is no use in wasting further time.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12046, the second deficiency bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether we are to take up this bill on next Monday or Tuesday. I understand the gentleman from Iowa is going to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GOOD. No; I do not intend to make a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The Unanimous Consent Calendar will come up on Monday, but there is only about a page, and the Chair would think that it would not take more than an hour or two, and then the Chair would recognize the gentleman from Iowa if he desires recognition.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks on this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following appointments to the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy:

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, Mr. VARE, Mr. KRAUS, Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, and Mr. KETTNER.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, the following leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, for 10 days, on account of important business.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE IMMIGRATION LAWS.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the enforcement of the immigration laws.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the enforcement of the immigration laws. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, in a speech made in this House on January 23, 1920, on the enactment and enforcement of immigration laws necessary to the protection of America as the home of Americans, among other things, I said:

The history of the dealings of Congress with immigration is the record of difficulties caused by shipowners, contract-labor importers, and other obstructions embarrassing all efforts to protect the country against incoming criminals, prostitutes, paupers, and anarchists.

In the record of this House and reports of committees and joint committees, and commissions created by both Houses, I have not found one statement that these laws are generally and effectually enforced. Again and again in the record of a period of more than 40 years is found the complaint of the violations or evasions of contract-labor laws.

Just now your committee is besieged with appeals from industrial employers not to close the door against incoming labor. This fact, considered with the other facts, should advise American labor that these people are still to be brought here to take their places. The interests of labor require that it be protected from the importation of an endless supply of European pauper labor.

Gentlemen, this problem needs the thoughtful, practical attention of Congress and the country. I am making this statement to bring this serious situation before you and the people. When I became a Member of this body I resolved to do something more than talk about this momentous question, with its bearing upon us and our children who are to succeed us. I sought and obtained a place on the committee which has this subject in charge and have attended every meeting of the committee. As a member of the subcommittee I spent several days in New York, the port through which most of these immigrants enter the country, studying the problem there and seeking to provide a remedy for it. I shall continue to give my best thought, attention, and labor to it and urge upon the committee, upon Congress, and upon the country such measures as will save our country from threatened ruin by the changing of America from a home for Americans to a Babylon of strange voices, strange faces, strange un-American ways, a place from which the spirit of America has taken its departure—another Europe, another Orient.

Since I used the language quoted the attack upon our immigration laws has intensified. For several days now a large delegation have been before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization asking that the laws be suspended or modified so as to admit to Texas approximately 200,000 pauper laborers annually and a corresponding number to neighboring States. The delegation consist of plantation owners, a labor agent for several large beet-sugar manufacturing corporations located in some 10 different States, sulphur-mine owners, lawyers, and others representing various interests. Coal-mine owners join in the request. As first proposed the measure would have admitted them only to Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico. A substitute or amendment was then proposed which would have extended the proposition to several other States. Still later it was proposed to give it still wider range, both as to the territory to be affected and the sources from which the immigrant laborers were to be admitted. All of them wanted several hundred thousand admitted annually by the suspension or removal of the literacy test, the \$8 head tax, and the labor-contract law. One attorney from New York said he represented certain farming interests of the Southwest, but could not, or would not, tell the committee what or how many farms he represented or the names of the owners.

I am reliably informed that a delegation on the same mission have been before the Senate Committee on Immigration for several days.

As a Member of the House and its Immigration Committee, I am actively opposing the proposition for several reasons, among which are the following:

I know from first-hand knowledge that interested men and corporations are now clamoring for pauper labor from Europe, China, Mexico, and elsewhere, and that these special interests are strong enough in congressional votes and influence to make the clamor a very dangerous one. Many Members represent constituencies a majority of which is of foreign birth and the

first generation children of such. Others represent great city or manufacturing districts. Many, for these or other reasons which seem to them sufficient, are opposed to all restriction of immigration. This demand for pauper labor has been heeded too much during the past 20 years. The story is always substantially the same. "We need the labor. The people we want are harmless. Do not let in the undesirable, but let in the ones we want."

If the law is broken down for accommodation of one class or section it will, of course, be destroyed for other classes and sections. The question is whether we shall maintain our immigration laws, at a time when their maintenance is more than ever necessary, or shall now weakly surrender them to give these and other men and interests pauper labor. With me, the question answers itself.

These Mexicans are very ignorant, degraded, and undesirable as citizens. One of these gentlemen said before the committee that the Mexicans were better as citizens than "poor white trash," by which I think he meant very poor white working people. I have known white people in the lowliest condition during my entire life, but I have never known any that as a class were not infinitely better as citizens or otherwise than average Mexicans.

I know that as a class Mexicans do not make good citizens. Let honest man and women reflect on what they have known in the past about politics in certain sections where these "good citizens" held the balance of political power. If 200,000 of these people are admitted to Texas annually they will soon become so numerous that they will swing the balance in close and vital contests, and cause Texas to turn her face backward toward things that are now hateful to most Texans.

The official figures show that 2 out of every 3 of these people who have come into Texas under war emergency orders during the last two and one-half years have not returned to Mexico. These figures are too small because of the admitted fact that tens of thousands were smuggled across by swimming the Rio Grande. In the vernacular of southwest Texas, they are called "wet backs." More than one of these gentlemen frankly, and with apparent pride, admitted that he had paid labor brokers so much per head for these "wet backs" delivered into his custody on the Texas side, a safe distance from immigration stations and officials. One explained that in order to keep them from running away while indebted to him for the price paid for their delivery, and for other advances, the employers had kept their shoes and trousers from them at night. Many similar side-lights were thrown on the character of these people and the manner of dealing with them, but they were all in line with what all Texas and all informed people have known about them since the people of Texas first came in contact with them in the days of Santa Anna and Sam Houston, in the days of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto.

Our immigration laws are going to be subjected to a severe strain during the next few years. The outside world is full of poverty-stricken human beings whose labor many special interests want. America has what a hungry world wants, a meal to satisfy its hunger. I pity suffering men and women everywhere, but I want our country preserved for a home for ourselves and our children. My position is fixed.

I did not object to any temporary emergency measure necessary to win the war, even to the admission of a comparatively few of these laborers while the boys were away, but this is a question of permanent peace policy, a question whether we shall save America as a home for these same boys, their brothers, their sisters, and their sweethearts.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 3779. An act to authorize the Ozark Forest road improvement district of Baxter County, Ark., to construct and maintain a bridge across the White River near Norfolk, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3418. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the lading or unlading of vessels at night, the preliminary entry of vessels, and for other purposes," approved February 13, 1911.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, February 2, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting as chairman of the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission a clause of proposed legislation to permit the acquisition of 47,708.50 square feet of land not now included within the taking lines (H. Doc. No. 639); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the president of the Capital Traction Co., transmitting report of the Capital Traction Co. for the year ending December 31, 1919; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of proposed legislation authorizing the relief of certain disbursing officers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of proposed legislation to provide for the relief of members of the United States Naval Reserve Force who were given temporary appointments in the Regular Navy prior to July 1, 1918; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5. A letter from the President of the East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co., transmitting a report of that company for the year ending December 31, 1919; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6. A letter from the president of the Georgetown Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of the Georgetown Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1919; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MCKENZIE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3037) to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer free of charge certain surplus motor-propelled vehicles and motor equipment to the Department of Agriculture, Post Office Department, Navy Department, and the Treasury Department for the use of the Public Health Service, and certain other surplus property to the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 593), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FORDNEY, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12193) providing for the relief of populations in Europe and in countries contiguous thereto suffering for the want of food, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 594), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5481) granting a pension to Scott Engle; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7271) granting an increase of pension to John Kennedy; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9505) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Cowan; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11163) granting a pension to James Hanna; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 12187) authorizing the Pitt River and the Apwaraiki Tribes or Bands of Indians of California to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 12188) for the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in the White Mountain National Forest in the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONNALLY: A bill (H. R. 12189) to repeal tariff duties on printing paper, wood pulp, and rag pulp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 12190) to authorize the Secretary of War, under rules and regulations prescribed by him, to pay cash rewards for suggestions and inventions which result in improvement or economy in the production of munitions or military material; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12191) to amend section 4888 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. L. 958), so as to require that applications and patents issued for inventions by inventors in Government service shall show the facts of such service; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12192) to amend the paragraph of the sundry civil appropriation act approved March 3, 1883, relative to patents, beginning with the words "The Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Patents," on page 625 of the Twenty-second Statutes at Large, by substituting a new paragraph in lieu thereof, so as to authorize the grant of patents, without payment of fee, for any invention or discovery useful in or for carrying on the functions and activities of the Government, when the application therefor contains the statement that such invention or discovery may be made and used by and for the Government without royalty; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 12193) providing for the relief of populations in Europe and in countries contiguous thereto suffering for the want of food; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12194) providing for a preliminary survey of Cowlitz River, Wash., with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, requesting the Congress of the United States to take such action in the reorganization of the military forces of the country which shall give to the National Guard the fullest measure of support; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, requesting the Congress of the United States to pass the bill already introduced appropriating funds to aid the several States in the construction of roads; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, urging the Congress of the United States to revise the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, urging Congress to revise the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, requesting the Congress of the United States to pass the bill already introduced appropriating funds to aid the several States in the construction of roads; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, requesting the Congress of the United States to take such action in the reorganization of the military forces which shall give to the National Guard the fullest measure of support; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENHAM: A bill (H. R. 12195) granting a pension to Edward S. Patton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12196) granting a pension to Vance K. Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12197) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. McCasland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12198) granting a pension to Columbus O. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 12199) for the relief of Louis A. Cornthwaite; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12200) for the relief of Frederick Hasiedel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 12201) for the relief of Elizabeth F. Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 12202) granting a pension to Francis H. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12203) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo D. Prosser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12204) for the relief of William E. Lucas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESHAR: A bill (H. R. 12205) granting a pension to Alfred J. Hester; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 12206) granting a pension to Mary R. Berridge; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12207) granting a pension to William T. Claiborne; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12208) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1242. By Mr. FREEMAN: Petition of citizens of New London, Conn., relative to House bill 262; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1243. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Clinton (Ill.) Commercial Club, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1244. By Mr. IRELAND: Petition of sundry city officials of Peoria, Ill., opposing the credit of \$150,000,000 to Europe by the United States Grain Corporation and favoring legislation by Congress that will give relief and protection to our own citizens of this country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1245. By Mr. McCLINTIC: Petition of the George Washington Branch of the Friends of Irish Freedom, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1246. Also, petition of the Lions Club of Holdenville, Hughes County, Okla., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1247. By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of the Federal Employees Union of Buffalo, N. Y., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

1248. By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition of citizens of Pike County, Ill., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

1249. Also, petition of the Kirby-Watkins Post, No. 198, American Legion, of Petersburg, Ill., indorsing House bill 5545; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1250. Also, petition of the Jacksonville (Ill.) post-office force, indorsing House bill 7012; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1251. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the Best Gas Traction Co., of Oakland, Calif., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1252. Also, petition of the Richard L. Townsend Post, No. 84, of Auburn, Calif., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1253. Also, petition of the representative meeting of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1254. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York City, relative to the custom service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1255. Also, petition of M. Clark & Sons, of San Francisco, Calif., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1256. Also, petition of J. F. Early, of San Francisco, Calif., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1257. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Mr. Frederick W. Trow, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1258. Also, petition of Rigney & Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1259. Also, petition of L. W. Trow, of New York, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1260. Also, petition of Dr. Samuel G. Tracy, of New York City, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1261. Also, petition of Hildreth & Co., engineers, of New York City, relative to certain testimony in the committees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1262. By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of the Northwestern Lumbermen's Association in convention assembled, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1263. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petitions of the Commercial Club of Jamestown, N. Dak., and the North Dakota Retail Merchants' Association, opposing the repeal of the zone postal system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1264. By Mr. VARE: Petition of the Central Labor Union of Philadelphia, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1265. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 331, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Glenside, Pa., protesting against the United States of America recognizing the so-called Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1266. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pottstown, Pa., opposing the passage of the Sterling bill (S. 3317) and the Graham bill (H. R. 11430); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

MONDAY, February 2, 1920.

Rev. John Paul Tyler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Command Thy benediction upon us, we beseech Thee, O Lord, God of our fathers, Lord of all the earth, as we enter upon the activities of this new day and this week. Grant us grace to look to Thee for wisdom and guidance, that with unselfish devotion to the cause of Thy righteousness in the earth we may give ourselves to the tasks before us.

We beseech Thy blessing upon our Nation, upon our world. We pray for the President of our United States, that if it be Thy gracious will he may soon be restored to perfect strength and health again. For every home represented here, for the loved ones wherever they may be, we pray Thy blessing, O Lord. So lead us and guide us, and keep us true and faithful unto Thee, that at last when we come into Thy presence we may hear Thy voice saying, "Well done." And this we ask for Jesus' sake. Amen.

On request of Mr. LODGE and by unanimous consent the reading of the Journal of Saturday's proceedings was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 197).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations in the sum of \$538,905 required by the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1920, and prior years, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 198).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$3,000 required by the National Park Service for the protection of a bridge in the Yellowstone National Park, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 199).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting a supplemental estimate in the sum of \$125,000 required by the Department of Agriculture for printing and binding for the fiscal year 1920, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CUSTOMS SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 196).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$1,000,000 required by the Customs Service for enforcing the provisions of law governing the importation and exportation of intoxicating liquors for the remainder of the fiscal year 1920, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO. (S. DOC. NO. 206).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1919, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON INTERURBAN RAILROAD CO. (S. DOC. NO. 204).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Interurban Railroad Co. for the year ended December 31, 1919, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.